arXiv:1401.7504v3 [math.DG] 28 Jun 2015

PSEUDOCONFORMAL STRUCTURES AND THE EXAMPLE OF FALBEL'S CROSS–RATIO VARIETY

IOANNIS D. PLATIS

Abstract. We introduce pseudoconformal structures on 4–dimensional manifolds and study their properties. Such structures are arising from two different complex operators which agree in a 2–dimensional subbundle of the tangent bundle; this subbundle thus forms a codimension 2 CR structure. A special case is that of a strictly pseudoconformal structure: in this case, the two complex operators are also opposite in a 2-dimensional subbundle which is complementary to the CR structure. A non trivial example of a manifold endowed with a (strictly) pseudoconformal structure is Falbel's cross–ratio variety $\mathfrak{X}$; this variety is isomorphic to the $\mathrm{PU}(2,1)$ configuration space of quadruples of pairwise distinct points in S^3. We first prove that there are two complex structures that appear naturally in $\mathfrak{X}$; these give $\mathfrak{X}$ a pseudoconformal structure which coincides with its well known CR structure. Using a non trivial involution of $\mathfrak{X}$ we then prove that $\mathfrak{X}$ is a strictly pseudoconformal manifold. The geometric meaning of this involution as well as its interconnections with the CR and complex structures of $\mathfrak{X}$ are also studied here in detail.

1. Introduction and Statement of Results

In this article we are aiming to reveal the ties between the several structures of Falbel's cross–ratio variety, a set which is isomorphic to the $\mathrm{PU}(2,1)$ configuration space of four pairwise distinct points in the sphere S^3. All these structures are encoded within the property of pseudoconformality, a notion which we also introduce in this work and we shall explain below. Our motivation comes from the classical case: to any quadruple $\mathfrak{p}=(p_1,p_2,p_3,p_4)$ of four pairwise distinct points in the Riemann sphere $S^2=\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}$, there is associated their (complex) *cross–ratio* which is the complex number $\mathbb{X}(\mathfrak{p})$ defined by

$$\mathbb{X}(\mathfrak{p})=[p_1,p_2,p_3,p_4]=\frac{p_4-p_2}{p_4-p_1}\cdot\frac{p_3-p_1}{p_3-p_2},$$

with the obvious modifications if one of the points is ∞. There are 24 cross–ratios associated to each such quadruple $\mathfrak{p}$, but due to symmetries it turns out that all possible cross–ratios depend complex analytically on $\mathbb{X}(\mathfrak{p})$. Letting the group of Möbius transformations $\mathrm{PSL}(2,\mathbb{C})$ of the Riemann sphere act diagonally on the set of quadruples of S^2, it is a classical result that the quotient set, that is, the $\mathrm{PSL}(2,\mathbb{C})$ configuration space of four points in S^2, is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0,1\}$ via $[\mathfrak{p}]\mapsto\mathbb{X}(\mathfrak{p})$. In this manner, it follows that the configuration space admits the structure of a 1–dimensional complex manifold, which is inherited from $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0,1\}$.

A far more complicated situation appears in the case of $\mathfrak{F}$, the $\mathrm{PU}(2,1)$ *configuration space of quadruples in* S^3. $\mathfrak{F}$ is the space of quadruples of pairwise distinct points in S^3, factored by the diagonal action of the projective unitary group $\mathrm{PU}(2,1)$. The sphere S^3 is identified via stereographic projection to $\mathfrak{H}\cup\{\infty\}$, where $\mathfrak{H}$ is the Heisenberg group. Recall that $\mathfrak{H}$ is the 2–step nilpotent Lie group with underlying manifold $\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{R}$ and multiplication law

$$(z,t)\star(w,s)=\left(z+w,t+s+2\Im(z\overline{w})\right),$$

Date: June 30, 2015
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classifications.* 32Q55, 53B99.
Key words. Cross–ratios, CR structures, pseudoconformal structures.

for each $(z,t),(w,s)\in\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{R}$. The set $\mathfrak{H}\cup\{\infty\}$ is also the boundary of complex hyperbolic plane $\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ and the projective unitary group $\mathrm{PU}(2,1)$ is the group of holomorphic isometries of $\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$; it acts doubly transitively on $\partial\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}=S^3$. There is a metric defined in $\mathfrak{H}$, called the Korányi metric; the group $\mathrm{PU}(2,1)$ is generated by the similarities of this metric together with an inversion, see Section 3.1.2 for details. Korányi and Reimann defined in [10] a complex cross-ratio $\mathbb{X}(\mathfrak{p})$ associated to a quadruple $\mathfrak{p}$ of pairwise distinct points $p_i=(z_i,t_i)$, $i=1,\dots,4$ in $S^3=\mathfrak{H}\cup\{\infty\}$ in the following manner: If $p\in S^3$, let $\mathcal{A}(z,t)=|z|^2-it$ if $p=(z,t)\in\mathfrak{H}$ and $\mathcal{A}(p)=\infty$ if $p=\infty$. Then the *complex cross–ratio* $\mathbb{X}(\mathfrak{p})$ is

$$\mathbb{X}(\mathfrak{p})=\frac{\mathcal{A}\left(p_4\star p_2^{-1}\right)}{\mathcal{A}\left(p_3\star p_1^{-1}\right)}\cdot\frac{\mathcal{A}\left(p_4\star p_1^{-1}\right)}{\mathcal{A}\left(p_3\star p_2^{-1}\right)},$$

with the obvious modifications if one of the points is ∞. This cross–ratio is invariant under the diagonal action of $\mathrm{PU}(2,1)$ in $\partial\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$. Falbel showed in [6], that the 24 cross–ratios associated to a quadruple $\mathfrak{p}$ satisfy symmetries analogous to those in the classical case. However, in this case all possible cross–ratios corresponding to a given quadruple depend real analytically on the following three:

$$\mathbb{X}_1=\mathbb{X}_1(\mathfrak{p})=[p_1,p_2,p_3,p_4],\quad \mathbb{X}_2=\mathbb{X}_2(\mathfrak{p})=[p_1,p_3,p_2,p_4]\quad\text{and}\quad \mathbb{X}_3=\mathbb{X}_3(\mathfrak{p})=[p_2,p_3,p_1,p_4],$$

which satisfy the next two conditions:

$$\begin{aligned}&|\mathbb{X}_2|=|\mathbb{X}_3||\mathbb{X}_1|,\\ &2|\mathbb{X}_1|^2\cdot\Re(\mathbb{X}_3)=|\mathbb{X}_1|^2+|\mathbb{X}_2|^2-2\Re(\mathbb{X}_1+\mathbb{X}_2)+1.\end{aligned}$$

These two equations define a 4–dimensional real subvariety $\mathfrak{X}$ of $\mathbb{C}^3$, which we call the *(Falbel's) cross–ratio variety*. It has been shown in [7] that $\mathfrak{F}$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{X}$ via the isomorphism

$$\varpi:\mathfrak{F}\ni[\mathfrak{p}]\mapsto(\mathbb{X}_1(\mathfrak{p}),\mathbb{X}_2(\mathfrak{p}),\mathbb{X}_3(\mathfrak{p}))\in\mathfrak{X},$$

see also Section 3.2 for further details. There is a special involution $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathfrak{X}$ which appears naturally on $\mathfrak{X}$. This is given by

$$\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{X}_1,\mathbb{X}_2,\mathbb{X}_3)=\left(\mathbb{X}_1,\mathbb{X}_2,\overline{\mathbb{X}_3}\right).$$

This involution was first observed by the authors of [13] and its geometric action was characterised there as very mysterious; if $\mathbb{X}_i=\mathbb{X}_i([\mathfrak{p}])$, $\mathfrak{p}=(p_1,p_2,p_3,p_4)$, $i=1,2,3$, then $(\varpi^{-1}\circ\mathcal{T}\circ\varpi)[\mathfrak{p}]$ is not induced by any permutation of the p_i (with the exception of the case where all p_i lie on a $\mathbb{C}-$circle; then $(\varpi^{-1}\circ\mathcal{T}\circ\varpi)[\mathfrak{p}]=[\mathfrak{p}]$). In this paper $\mathcal{T}$ plays a crucial role; this role shall be gradually unfolded in the sequel.

Besides Falbel's own results, see [6], cross–ratio variety $\mathfrak{X}$ has been studied in [13], [14], see also [4] for a different approach. An extensive study of the geometric structures of $\mathfrak{X}$ is [7]; here are the main results:

First, there is 4–dimensional real manifold structure on a subset $\mathfrak{X}'$ of $\mathfrak{X}$ (see Theorem 3.7 below). The inverse image $\varpi^{-1}(\mathfrak{X}')$ comprises equivalent classes of a quadruples (p_1,p_2,p_3,p_4) such that not all p_i lie in a $\mathbb{C}-$circle (for the definition of a $\mathbb{C}-$circle, see Section 3.1.2).

Secondly, there is a CR structure $\mathcal{H}$ of codimension 2 defined on a subset $\mathfrak{X}''$ of $\mathfrak{X}$ (see Theorem 3.8 below; details about CR structures are in Section 2.1). The inverse image $\varpi^{-1}(\mathfrak{X}'')$ comprises equivalence classes of quadruples (p_1,p_2,p_3,p_4) such that p_1,p_2,p_3 do not all lie in a $\mathbb{C}-$circle. We show in Theorem 3.9 that this structure is actually an *antiholomorphic* CR submanifold structure: the distribution $\mathcal{V}=\mathcal{T}_*(\mathcal{H})$ ($\mathcal{T}_*$ is the derivative of $\mathcal{T}$) is complementary to the distribution $\mathcal{H}$ that defines the CR structure of $\mathfrak{X}$; moreover, if $\mathbb{J}$ denotes the natural complex structure of $\mathbb{C}^3$, then $\mathbb{J}\mathcal{V}\cap T(\mathfrak{X}^*)=\{0\}$.

Thirdly, there is a structure of a 2–dimensional disconnected complex manifold biholomorphic to $\mathbb{C}P^1 \times (\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R})$, defined on a subset $\mathfrak{X}^*$ of $\mathfrak{X}$ (see Theorem 3.10 below); we denote this structure by J. The inverse image $\varpi^{-1}(\mathfrak{X}^*)$ comprises equivalent classes of a quadruples (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4) such that p_2, p_3 do not lie in the same orbit of the stabiliser of p_1, p_4.

In this paper we show that apart from the complex structure J, there also exists another complex structure defined on $\mathfrak{X}^*$ which we shall denote by I. This structure is inherited from a Levi strictly pseudoconvex subset $\mathcal{P}$ of $\mathbb{C}^2$, see Section 4.1.

We therefore wish to clarify the relations of all the afore mentioned structures, namely the complex structures I and J and the codimension 2 antiholomorphic CR structure $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{V})$ of the cross–ratio variety which is induced by the involution $\mathcal{T}$. It will eventually turn out that in the subset $\mathfrak{X}^*$ of $\mathfrak{X}$, which is a complex manifold with respect both the complex structures I and J, we have the following:

(1) $T(\mathfrak{X}^*) = \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{V}$, (here $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{V})$ is the restriction of the antiholomorphic CR structure to $\mathfrak{X}^*$);
(2) Both I and J are bundle automorphisms of both $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ and moreover, $I \equiv J$ is on $\mathcal{H}$ and $I \equiv -J$ on $\mathcal{V}$.

4-dimensional manifolds M with an antiholomorphic CR structure $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{V})$ and with complex structures I and J which satisfy condition (2) above, have an interest of their own. Therefore we choose to obtain our result on the cross–ratio variety via a more general setting: We introduce the notions of *pseudoconformal (psc)* and *strictly pseudoconformal (apsc)* manifolds, which we study in detail in Section 2. We remark at this point that the term *pseudoconformal* which inspired our definition, is found for instance in p. 138 of [1]; there it is used as an alternative for CR *mappings*.[1]

A pseudoconformal manifold is actually a CR manifold whose CR structure arises from two (a priori different) complex structures defined on the manifold. To be more precise, let M be a 4–dimensional real manifold and suppose that it is endowed with two complex structures I and J. Suppose also that there exist a 1–complex dimensional subbundle $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M, I)$ of the $(1,0)-$tangent bundle $T^{(1,0)}(M, I)$, such that

$$(id._*)\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M, I) = \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M, J),$$

where $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M, J)$ is a 1–complex dimensional subbundle of $T^{(1,0)}(M, J)$ and $(id._*)$ is the differential of the identity mapping $id. : (M, I) \to (M, J)$. To avoid trivial cases (i.e., that I and J are either the same or opposite on M, in other words the cases where the identity mapping $id. : (M, I) \to (M, J)$ is either holomorphic or antiholomorphic), we require from the subbundle $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M, I)$ to be the maximal one with this property: Maximality here is meant in terms of both dimension and uniqueness, that is, if $\mathcal{H}' \subset T^{(1,0)}$ is such that $(id._*)\mathcal{H}' \subset T^{(1,0)}(M, J)$, then $\mathcal{H}' = \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M, I)$. We then call the triple (M, I, J) a *psc manifold*.

Let $\mathcal{H}(M)$ be the underlying real subbundle of $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M, I)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M, J)$, which we call the *horizontal bundle*. Consider M as a real manifold with the complex operators I and J acting as bundle automorphisms on $\mathcal{H}(M)$. Then $(\mathcal{H}(M), I)$ and $(\mathcal{H}(M), J)$ are CR structures of codimension 2 in M, and the main observation is that by the very definition of the psc manifold we have that the map $id. : M \to M$ is also a CR diffeomorphism. Therefore the two CR structures of codimension 2 in M are equivalent. It also follows that psc manifolds have the property that *the complex structures I and J are identified on the underlying real bundle $\mathcal{H}(M)$*. Clearly, a psc structure on M induces a unique CR structure on M by identifying the two equivalent CR structures. But the converse does not hold in general; for this to happen, the bundle automorphisms I and J have to be extended to integrable almost complex automorphisms of M. The problem of finding natural cases at which this can be done lead us to the next class of manifolds.

[1] B. McKay pointed out to me that it was actually E. Cartan who first used the term, see [2].

Let (M,I,J) be a psc manifold which also has the following property: There exist splittings of $T^{(1,0)}(M,I)$, $T^{(1,0)}(M,J)$ into direct sums $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M,I)\oplus\mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M,I)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M,I)\oplus\mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M,I)$, respectively, such that

$$(id._*)\mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M,I)=\overline{\mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M,J)}=\mathcal{V}^{(0,1)}(M,J).$$

Then (M,I,J) shall be called a *strictly pseudoconformal (spsc) manifold*. Let $\mathcal{V}(M)$ be the underlying real subbundle of $\mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M,I)$ and $\mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M,J)$, which we call the *vertical bundle*; we have that

$$(id.)_*(\mathcal{V}(M),I)=(\mathcal{V}(M),-J).$$

All in all, spsc manifolds enjoy the property we wish to prove that $\mathfrak{X}^*$ also enjoys: Their real 4–dimensional tangent bundle admits a decomposition

$$T(M)=\mathcal{H}(M)\oplus\mathcal{V}(M),$$

where $\mathcal{H}(M)$ and $\mathcal{V}(M)$ are the underlying 2–dimensional real subbundles of the horizontal and the vertical bundles of M respectively, and are such that $I\equiv J$ on $\mathcal{H}(M)$ and $I\equiv -J$ on $\mathcal{V}(M)$.

Note that in contrast with the case of a psc manifold where there is no information about the relation of the complex structures I and J away from the horizontal bundle, in the case of a spsc manifold the relation of I and J is determined precisely on the whole of the tangent space. In principle, one cannot obtain a spsc structure out of an arbitrary psc manifold (M,I,J). However, this actually happens in the case where there is an involution $\mathcal{T}_M$ of M which fixes no point of M and is holomorphic with respect to one of the complex structures and antiholomorphic with respect to the other, see Corollary 2.16. We finally mention that they may exist *singular sets* in a psc (resp. apsc) structure (M,I,J): These comprise points $p\in M$ such that

(1) $\mathcal{H}_p(M)=\{0\}$ in the psc case and
(2) $\mathcal{H}_p(M)=\{0\}$ and $\mathcal{V}_p(M)=\{0\}$ in the apsc case.

The subset $\mathfrak{X}^*$ of the cross–ratio variety $\mathfrak{X}$ constitutes a concrete, non trivial example of a psc as well as of a spsc manifold. In fact we have (see Section 4.2):

Theorem 1.1. *Away from a certain singular set, the triple $(\mathfrak{X}^*,I,J)$ is a psc manifold. Moreover, the* CR *submanifold structure of $(\mathfrak{X}^*,I,J)$ induced by its pseudoconformality coincides with the* CR *submanifold structure, as this is defined in Section 3.5.2.*

Using the crucial fact that the involution $\mathcal{T}:\mathfrak{X}\to\mathfrak{X}$ is $I-$holomorphic and $J-$antiholomorphic we obtain as a corollary the following:

Theorem 1.2. *Away from a certain singular set, the psc manifold $(\mathfrak{X}^*,I,J)$ is spsc. Moreover, the* CR *submanifold structure of $(\mathfrak{X}^*,I,J)$ induced by its strict pseudoconformality coincides with the antiholomorphic* CR *submanifold structure, as this is defined in Section 3.5.2.*

However, the question of revealing the mysterious geometric nature of $\mathcal{T}$ remains; in Section 5 we prove a theorem (see Theorem 5.1) which actually says that if $\mathfrak{p}$ is a quadruple of pairwise distinct points which do not all lie in a $\mathbb{C}-$circle and $[\mathfrak{p}']=(\varpi^{-1}\circ\mathcal{T}\circ\varpi)([\mathfrak{p}])$, then the points of $\mathfrak{p}'$ are obtained out of the points of $\mathfrak{p}$ after applying to the latter suitable elements of $\mathrm{PU}(2,1)$. These elements are congruent to Heisenberg similarities which depend only on the cross–ratios $\mathbb{X}_i$, $i=1,2,3$ of $\mathfrak{p}$.

This paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we review some well known facts about CR structures and we introduce psc and spsc structures in 4–dimensional manifolds. Section 3 is a broad review of the well known manifold, CR and complex structures of $\mathfrak{X}$. For clarity, and due to the different conventions about $\mathfrak{X}$ considered in [7], we repeat the proofs of these results here. The proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 lies in Section 4. Section 5 is devoted to the geometric interpretation

of the involution $\mathcal{T}$. Finally, in Section 6 we provide furter details about the cross–ratio variety, especially about its several singular sets.

2. Pseudoconformal Structures

The material in this section is divided in two parts. The content of the first part is well known; there is a vast bibliography about CR structures which we review in Section 2.1, see for instance [1], [3], [5]. In Section 2.2 we study the notions of what we shall call pseudoconformal mappings and pseudoconformal manifolds. Both these notions are very much alike CR mappings and CR manifolds; the case we are interested in is that of codimension 2, but there are direct generalisations.

2.1. **Preliminaries:** CR **structures.** There are two equivalent definitions of an *abstract* CR *structure*. Suppose first that M is a $(2p+s)-$dimensional real manifold. A CR *structure of codimension s in M* is a pair $(\mathcal{D}, J)$ where $\mathcal{D}$ is a $2p-$dimensional smooth subbundle of $T(M)$ and J is a bundle automorphism of $\mathcal{D}$ such that:

(i) $J^2 = -id.$ and
(ii) if X and Y are sections of $\mathcal{D}$ then the same holds for $[X,Y]-[JX,JY]$, $[JX,Y]+[X,JY]$ and moreover $J([X,Y]-[JX,JY]) = [JX,Y]+[X,JY]$.

On the other hand, let M be a $(2p+s)-$dimensional real manifold and let $T^{\mathbb{C}}(M)$ be its complexified tangent bundle. A CR structure of codimension s in M is a complex $p-$dimensional smooth subbundle $\mathcal{H}$ of $T^{\mathbb{C}}(M)$ such that:

(i) $\mathcal{H} \cap \overline{\mathcal{H}} = \{0\}$ and
(ii) $\mathcal{H}$ is involutive, that is for any vector fields Z and W in $\mathcal{H}$ we have $[Z,W] \in \mathcal{H}$.

The two definitions are equivalent; see for instance Theorem 1.1, Chpt. VI of [1]. A manifold endowed with a CR structure is called a CR *manifold*. A special class of CR manifolds are generic submanifolds of complex manifolds: Suppose that N is a complex manifold of complex dimension n with complex structure J, and let M be a submanifold of N of real dimension m. Then if

$$\mathcal{H} = T(M) \cap J(T(M)),$$

i.e., the maximal invariant subspace of $T(M)$ under the action of J, is also a smooth subbundle on M, then M is called a *generic submanifold of* (N,J). A generic submanifold is in fact a CR manifold (see for instance Theorem 2.1, p.135 of [1]). The CR structure is $(\mathcal{H}, J)$, where here by J we denote the bundle automorphism induced by the restriction of J in $\mathcal{H}$. The corresponding complex subbundle is

$$\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)} = \{Z \in T^{\mathbb{C}}(M) \mid Z = X - iJX,\ X \in \mathcal{H}\},$$

and we have

$$X \in \mathcal{H} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad Z = X - iJX \in \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}.$$

Suppose finally that M is a generic submanifold of the $n-$dimensional complex manifold N with $n = p+s$, such that $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} M = 2p+s$, where $2p = \dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{H}$. Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a subbundle of M complementary to $\mathcal{H}$:

$$T(M) = \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{V}.$$

Note that $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{V} = s$. If

$$J(\mathcal{V}) \cap T(M) = \{0\},$$

we call M an *antiholomorphic* CR *submanifold* of N, see p. 136 of [1].

CR diffeomorphisms are defined as follows: Let M and M' be CR manifolds of the same dimension $m = 2p+s$ with CR structures $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{H}'$ respectively, of the same dimension s. A diffeomorphism $F : M \to M'$ is a CR *diffeomorphism* if it preserves CR structures; that is $F_*\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}'$. In other words, F is a CR diffeomorphism if and only if for each $Z \in \mathcal{H}$ we have $F_*Z \in \mathcal{H}'$. In terms of the

corresponding real distributions $(\mathcal{D}, J)$ and $(\mathcal{D}', J')$ we may say that F is CR if for each $X \in \mathcal{D}$ we have $F_*(JX) = J'(F_*X)$.

In this paper we are concerned in particular with CR structures on subvarieties of $\mathbb{C}^n$. We consider the manifold $\mathbb{C}^n$, $n > 1$, with the natural complex coordinates $(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n)$, $\zeta_i = x_i + iy_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Denote also by $\mathbb{J}$ the natural complex structure of $\mathbb{C}^n$. An $m-$real dimensional smooth subvariety of $\mathbb{C}^n$ is locally defined by a set of equations

$$F_i(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, k = 2n - m.$$

The set M consisting of points of the subvariety at which the matrix

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial x_1} & \dots & \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial x_n} & \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial y_1} & \dots & \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial y_n} \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial F_k}{\partial x_1} & \dots & \frac{\partial F_k}{\partial x_n} & \frac{\partial F_k}{\partial y_1} & \dots & \frac{\partial F_k}{\partial y_n} \end{bmatrix}$$

is of constant rank k is a real submanifold of $\mathbb{C}^n$ with $\dim(M) = m$. Its tangent space $T_x(M)$ at a point $x \in M$ is identified to the set

$$T_x(M) = \{X \in T_x(\mathbb{C}^n) \mid (dF_i)_x(X) = 0,\ i = 1, \dots, k\}.$$

The maximal complex subspace $\mathcal{H}_x$ at each $x \in M$ comprises of $X \in T_x(\mathbb{C}^n)$ such that

$$(dF_i)_x(X) = 0 \ \text{ and } \ (d^cF_i)_x(X) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots k, \quad \text{where } \ (d^cF_i)_x(X) = -(dF_i)_x(\mathbb{J}X).$$

Let

$$\mathcal{H}_x^{(1,0)} = \{Z = X - i\mathbb{J}X \in T^{(1,0)}(\mathbb{C}^n) \mid X \in \mathcal{H}_x\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{H}_x^{(1,0)}$ comprises of $Z \in T_x^{(1,0)}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ such that

$$(\partial F_i)_x(Z) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots k,$$

and one verifies that

$$X \in \mathcal{H}_x \ \text{ if and only if } \ Z = X - i\mathbb{J}X \in \mathcal{H}_x^{(1,0)}.$$

Denote by $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}$ the complex subbundle comprising of $\mathcal{H}_x^{(1,0)}$, $x \in M$. At points $x \in M$ consider the matrix

$$D^{(1,0)} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial \zeta_1} & \dots & \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial \zeta_n} \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial F_k}{\partial \zeta_1} & \dots & \frac{\partial F_k}{\partial \zeta_n} \end{bmatrix},$$

and let $M' \subset M$ be the set at which $D^{(1,0)}$ is of constant rank $l \leq k$. Then $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}$ is defined at M', $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)} = n - l = p$ and therefore, if the integrability condition

$$[Z_i, Z_j] \in \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)} \quad \text{for every } \ i, j = 1, \dots p,\ i \neq j,$$

holds, then $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}$ is a CR structure of codimension $s = 2l - k$ since $m = 2n - k = 2p + s$. We call the set $\mathcal{S} = M \setminus M'$ the *singular set* of the CR structure.

In the particular case when $k = l = n - 1$, that is $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)} = 1$, the single vector field generating the CR structure is

$$Z = D_{\zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_n} \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta_1} + D_{\zeta_3, \dots, \zeta_n, \zeta_1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta_2} + \dots + D_{\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{n-1}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta_n},$$

where

$$D_{\zeta_{i_1},\zeta_{i_{n-1}}} = \left|\frac{\partial(F_1,\ldots,F_{n-1})}{\partial(\zeta_{i_1},\ldots,\zeta_{i_{n-1}})}\right|$$

are the $(n-1)-$minor subdeterminants of $D^{(1,0)}$. Note that in this case, the above integrability condition holds vacuously. Also in this case, the *Levi form* $(L)_p : \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}_p \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined in M' by

$$Z_p \mapsto (L_1(p),\ldots,L_{n-1}(p)) = \left(dd^cF_1(Z,\overline{Z})_p,\ldots,dd^cF_{n-1}(Z,\overline{Z})_p\right),$$

where

$$L_i(p) = \begin{bmatrix} D_{\zeta_2,\ldots,\zeta_n} & \ldots & D_{\zeta_1,\ldots,\zeta_{n-1}}\end{bmatrix}_p \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 F_i}{\partial\zeta_1\partial\overline{\zeta_1}} & \ldots & \frac{\partial^2 F_i}{\partial\zeta_1\partial\overline{\zeta_n}} \\ \vdots & \ldots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial^2 F_i}{\partial\zeta_n\partial\overline{\zeta_1}} & \ldots & \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial\zeta_n\partial\overline{\zeta_n}}\end{bmatrix}_p \cdot \begin{bmatrix} D_{\overline{\zeta_2},\ldots,\overline{\zeta_n}} \\ \vdots \\ D_{\overline{\zeta_1},\ldots,\overline{\zeta_{n-1}}}\end{bmatrix}_p .$$

2.2. **Pseudoconformal Structures.** Pseudoconformal structures that we are about to define are quite relative to CR structures. The main difference is that whether in the CR case there is no prescribed complex structure, in the pseudoconformal case there are prescribed two a priori different complex structures.

2.2.1. *Pseudoconformal mappings and submanifolds.* We start with a definition.

Definition 2.1. Let (M,I) and (N,J) be complex manifolds with complex structures I and J respectively, $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(M) = 2$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(N) = n \geq 2$. A smooth immersion $F : M \to N$ shall be called *pseudoconformal (psc)* if there exists a 1–complex dimensional subbundle $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M,I)$ of $T^{(1,0)}(M,I)$ such that

$$F_*\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M,I) \subset T^{(1,0)}(N,J),$$

and $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M,I)$ is the maximal subbundle with this property: If $(\mathcal{H}')^{(1,0)}(M,I)$ is any subbundle of $T^{(1,0)}(M,I)$ such that $F_*(\mathcal{H}')^{(1,0)}(M,I) \subset T^{(1,0)}(N,J)$, then $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M,I) = (\mathcal{H}')^{(1,0)}(M,I)$. We call $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M,I)$ (resp. $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(F(M),J)$) the *horizontal bundle* of M (resp. of N). In the case where $n > 2$ and M is an immersed submanifold of N, then the manifold (M,I) is called a *psc submanifold (of codimension 2)* of (N,J).

When there is no risk of confusion, the underlying 2–dimensional real subbundles $\mathcal{H}(M)$ and $\mathcal{H}(F(M))$ of $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M,I)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(F(M),J)$ respectively, shall be also called horizontal bundles (of M and N respectively).

At this point we wish to make some remarks on Definition 2.1. The first remark has to do with the restriction $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(N,J) = 1$; if it is replaced by $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(N,J) = 2$, then by the Newlander–Nirenberg Theorem F is holomorphic ($F_*I = JF_*$ everywhere on $T(M)$), and N is a complex submanifold of M. By putting the maximality condition in Definition 2.1 we do not allow such a case. Moreover, we cannot either have that F is antiholomorphic, $F_*I = -JF_*$ everywhere on $T(M)$; this contradicts the equality $F_*I = JF_*$ on $\mathcal{H}(M)$. Second, in the case where $m = 2$ and F is a smooth diffeomorphism, it is clear that F is psc if and only if F^{-1} is psc; such diffeomorphisms are studied below. But perhaps the most important observation is given by the next proposition whose proof follows directly from Definition 2.1.

Proposition 2.2. *Let (M,I) and (N,J) be as above and let F be a psc immersion with horizontal bundle $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M,I)$. Denote by $\mathcal{H}(M)$ the underlying 2–real dimensional real subbundle of $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M,I)$. Then the following hold:*

(1) *Consider M and N as real manifolds and their complex structures as bundle automorphisms such that $I^2 = J^2 = -id.$, acting only on $\mathcal{H}(M)$ and $\mathcal{H}(F(M))$, respectively. Then M and N are* CR *manifolds of codimension 2 and the* CR *structures are $(\mathcal{H}(M), I)$ and $(F_*\mathcal{H}(M), J)$ respectively.*
(2) *$F : M \to N$ is a* CR *map; the immersed submanifold $F(M)$ is a generic submanifold of M with a codimension 2* CR *structure.*

Hence psc mappings are CR mappings; the converse is of course not generally true. The following proposition gives a useful local description of psc mappings.

Proposition 2.3. *The smooth immersion $F : (M, I) \to (N, J)$ is psc if and only if at each point $p \in M$, there exists a local parametrisation $(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \mapsto (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ of F, ((ζ_1, ζ_2) are local $I-$holomorphic coordinates around p and $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m)$ are local $J-$holomorphic coordinates around $F(p)$), such that*

$$\operatorname{rank}(DF^{(0,1)}) = 1, \quad \textit{where} \quad DF^{(0,1)} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial\overline{\xi_1}}{\partial\zeta_1} & \frac{\partial\overline{\xi_1}}{\partial\zeta_2} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial\overline{\xi_m}}{\partial\zeta_1} & \frac{\partial\overline{\xi_m}}{\partial\zeta_2} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{2.1}$$

Proof. We first prove that F is psc if and only if condition (2.1) holds for *each* local representation $(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \mapsto (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m)$ of F. For this, let $Z \in T^{(1,0)}(M, I)$ with a local representation $Z = \sum_{i=1}^{2} a_i(\partial/\partial\zeta_i)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} F_*Z &= \sum_{i=1}^{2} a_i \, F_*\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\zeta_i}\right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{2} a_i \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{\partial\xi_j}{\partial\zeta_i}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi_j}\right) + \sum_{i=1}^{2} a_i \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{\partial\overline{\xi_j}}{\partial\zeta_i}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{\xi_j}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, and due to linear independence, $F_*Z \in T^{(1,0)}(N, J)$ if and only if the linear system

$$\begin{gathered} \frac{\partial\overline{\xi_1}}{\partial\zeta_1}\, a_1 + \frac{\partial\overline{\xi_1}}{\partial\zeta_2}\, a_2 = 0, \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\partial\overline{\xi_m}}{\partial\zeta_1}\, a_1 + \frac{\partial\overline{\xi_m}}{\partial\zeta_2}\, a_2 = 0, \end{gathered}$$

admits non zero solutions, which is equivalent to condition 2.1.

For the converse, fix $p \in M$ and let $(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \mapsto (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m)$ be the local representation of F around p in which (2.1) holds. If $(\zeta_1', \zeta_2') \mapsto (\xi_1', \dots, \xi_n')$ is another local representation around p with corresponding matrix $D\tilde{F}^{(0,1)}$, consider the holomorphic change of coordinates $(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \mapsto (\zeta_1', \zeta_2')$ and $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m) \mapsto (\xi_1', \dots, \xi_m')$. Then, from the chain rule we have

$$D\tilde{F}^{(0,1)} = \frac{\partial(\overline{\xi_1'}, \dots, \overline{\xi_m'})}{\partial(\overline{\xi_1}, \dots, \overline{\xi_m})} \cdot DF^{(0,1)} \cdot \frac{\partial(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)}{\partial(\zeta_1', \zeta_2')},$$

and our assertion is proved. □

We comment here that $\operatorname{rank}(DF^{(0,1)}) = 1$ is equivalent to saying that all minor 2×2 subdeterminants $\left|\frac{\partial(\overline{\xi_j}, \overline{\xi_k})}{\partial(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)}\right|$ vanish for each $j, k = 1, \dots, m$, $j \neq k$ and the partial derivatives do not vanish

simultaneously. However, points of M where all partial derivatives vanish simultaneously might exist; the set of these points is defined below.

Definition 2.4. Let $F : (M, I) \to (N, J)$ be a psc mapping. The set

$$\mathcal{S} = \left\{ p \in M \mid (F_{*,p})\mathcal{H}_p^{(1,0)}(M, I) = 0 \right\},$$

is called the *singular set* of F.

2.2.2. *Antiholomorphic pseudoconformal submanifolds.* The following proposition connects psc immersions of a certain nature with antiholomorphic CR submanifold structures.

Proposition 2.5. *Suppose that (M, I) is a 2–dimensional manifold which is pseudoconformally immersed into the $n-$complex dimensional complex manifold (N, J), $n > 2$. Let $\iota : M \hookrightarrow N$ be the inclusion and let $\mathcal{H}(M)$ be the underlying real subbundle of the horizontal bundle $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M, I)$. Suppose in addition that there exists an 2–real dimensional subbundle $\mathcal{V}(M)$ of the tangent bundle $T(M)$ such that:*

$$T(M) = \mathcal{H}(M) \oplus \mathcal{V}(M),$$

Then M inherits from ι an antiholomorphic CR *submanifold structure of codimension 2.*

Proof. Let $\widetilde{T}(M)$ be the tangent bundle of M in N and let also $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(M) = \iota_*\mathcal{H}(M)$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(M) = \iota_*\mathcal{V}(M)$. We have

$$\widetilde{T}(M) = \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(M) \oplus \widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(M),$$

therefore

$$\begin{aligned} J\widetilde{T}(M) &= J\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(M) \oplus J\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(M) \\ &= \iota_* I\mathcal{H}(M) \oplus J\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(M) \\ &= \iota_*\mathcal{H}(M) \oplus J\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(M) \\ &= \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(M) \oplus J\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(M) \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(M) &= \widetilde{T}(M) \cap J\widetilde{T}(M) \\ &= \left(\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(M) \oplus \widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(M)\right) \oplus \left(\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(M) \oplus J\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(M)\right) \\ &= \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(M) \oplus \left(\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(M) \cap J\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(M)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we must have $\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(M) \cap J\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(M) = \{0\}$ and we conclude that

$$J\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(M) \cap \widetilde{T}(M) = J\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(M) \cap \left(\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(M) \oplus \widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(M)\right) = \{0\}.$$

Therefore M is an antiholomorphic CR submanifold of codimension 2 of N. □

Since (M, I) is a complex manifold we may always assume that $\mathcal{V}(M)$ is $I-$invariant. In this case, we also have a splitting

$$T^{(1,0)}(M, I) = \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M, I) \oplus \mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M, I),$$

where $\mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M, I) = \{W - iIW \mid W \in \mathcal{V}(M)\}$. We call $\mathcal{V}(M)$ (and $\mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M, I)$) the *vertical bundle of M*.

Remark 2.6. Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathbb{C}} = \iota_* \mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M,I)$. Then

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathbb{C}} \cap \widetilde{T}^{(1,0)}(M,J) = \{0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathbb{C}} \cap \widetilde{T}^{(0,1)}(M,J) = \{0\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Indeed, left relation of (2.2) holds because of pseudoconformality. To show the right relation, suppose that there exists a $W \in \mathcal{V}(M)$ and an $X \in \widetilde{T}(M)$ such that

$$\iota_* W - i\iota_*(IW) = X + iJX.$$

Therefore $X = \widetilde{W} = \iota_* W \in \widetilde{V}(M)$ and also $\iota_*(IW) = -JX \in J\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(M)$. Applying J to the last relation we have $X = J(\iota_*(IW)) \in J\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(M)$. From the proof of Proposition 2.5 we deduce $X = 0$.

We conclude that $\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathbb{C}}$ consists of complex vector fields of mixed type with respect to J, i.e., if $\widetilde{W} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{V}}^{\mathbb{C}}$ then $\widetilde{W} = \widetilde{W}_1 + \widetilde{W}_2$ where $\widetilde{W}_1$ is of type $(1,0)$, $\widetilde{W}_2$ is of type $(0,1)$ and neither of which is zero.

An antiholomorphic psc submanifold (M,I) of (N,J) is trivially a psc submanifold of (N,J). The converse is also true in the following case which is of our particular interest.

Corollary 2.7. *Suppose that (M,I) is a psc submanifold of (N,J), $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(M) = 2$. Suppose that there exist a holomorphic involution $\mathcal{T}_M$ of M. Then (M,I) is an antiholomorphic psc submanifold of (N,J).*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M,I) = \langle Z \rangle$, $Z \in T^{(1,0)}(M,I)$, $Z = X - iIX$. Then $W = (\mathcal{T}_M)_*(Z) \in T^{(1,0)}(M,I)$ since $\mathcal{T}_M$ is $I-$holomorphic. Let $\mathcal{H}(M) = \langle X, IX \rangle$ and define

$$\mathcal{V}(M) = \langle (\mathcal{T}_M)_*(X), (\mathcal{T}_M)_*(IX) = I\left((\mathcal{T}_M)_*(X)\right) \rangle.$$

Since $\mathcal{T}_M$ is an involution, $\mathcal{H}(M) \cap \mathcal{V}(M) = \emptyset$ and since also $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(M) = 2$, $T(M) = \mathcal{H}(M) \oplus \mathcal{V}(M)$. The result now follows from Proposition 2.5. □

2.2.3. *Pseudoconformal diffeomorphisms and manifolds.* Suppose that (N,J) and (M,I) are as before but now $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(N) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(M) = 2$ and $F : (M,I) \to (N,J)$ is a psc diffeomorphism. We call (M,I) and (N,J) *pseudoconformally equivalent* and the following corollary is evident.

Corollary 2.8. *A smooth diffeomorphism $F : (M,I) \to (N,J)$ is psc if and only if at each point $p \in M$ there exists a local representation $(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \mapsto (z_1, z_2)$ of F,((ζ_1, ζ_2) are local $I-$holomorphic coordinates around p and (z_1, z_2) are local $J-$holomorphic coordinates around $F(p)$), such that*

$$\left| \frac{\partial(\overline{z_1}, \overline{z_2})}{\partial(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)} \right| = 0 \text{ (which is equivalent to } \left| \frac{\partial(\overline{\zeta_1}, \overline{\zeta_2})}{\partial(z_1, z_2)} \right| = 0), \tag{2.3}$$

where the partial derivatives involved do not vanish simultaneously.

We are mostly interested in the case when $M = N$ is a 4–dimensional real manifold endowed with complex structures I and J arising from atlantes $\mathcal{A}_I$ and $\mathcal{A}_J$ respectively. If these structures are psc equivalent, i.e., the identity mapping $id. : (M,I) \to (M,J)$ is psc, then we call (M,I,J) a *psc manifold*. From the previous discussion it follows that the horizontal bundles $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M,I)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(N,J)$ are holomorphically identified via the derivative $id._*$, that is, $I \equiv J$ on the underlying real bundle $\mathcal{H}(M)$. The resulting bundle via this identification, which we shall denote simply by $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M)$, is a 1–complex dimensional subbundle of $T(M) \otimes \mathbb{C}$; it is also a CR structure of codimension 2 in M in the usual sense when the action of the complex structures are considered only in $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M)$.

The next proposition follows directly from Corollary 2.8 and shows that in a psc manifold (M,I,J) the unified atlas $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_I \cup \mathcal{A}_J$ is such that the transition maps from charts of $\mathcal{A}_I$ to charts of $\mathcal{A}_J$ are psc diffeomorphisms of open sets in $\mathbb{C}^2$.

Proposition 2.9. *Let (M, I, J) be a 4-dimensional real manifold with complex structures J and I arising from the atlantes $\mathcal{A}_J = \{(U_j, \phi_j)\}$ and $\mathcal{A}_I = \{(V_i, \psi_i)\}$ respectively. Then (M, I, J) is psc if and only if for each $p \in M$ there exist $(U_p, \phi_p) \in \mathcal{A}_J$ and $(V_p, \psi_p) \in \mathcal{A}_I$ so that the map $\psi \circ \phi^{-1} : \phi_p(U_p \cap V_p) \to \psi_p(U_p \cap V_p)$ is a psc diffeomorphism. Explicitly, if $\phi_p : q \mapsto (\zeta_1, \zeta_2)$ for each $q \in U_p$ and $\psi_p : r \mapsto (z_1, z_2)$ for each $r \in V_p$ and $\psi \circ \phi^{-1}$ is given by $(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \mapsto (z_1, z_2)$, then Condition (2.3) holds.*

We also have the following proposition which is quite expected: Equivalent psc structures immersed in $\mathbb{C}^n$ produce equivalent CR submanifold structures.

Proposition 2.10. *Let M and N be 2–dimensional pseudoconformally equivalent complex manifolds with complex structures J and I respectively. Let also $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M, I)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(N, J)$ be the horizontal bundles of (M, I) and (N, J) respectively. We suppose that there exists a psc immersion $F_M : (M, I) \to \mathbb{C}^n$ so that*

$$(F_M)_* \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M, I) = \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}$$

is a CR *structure of codimension 2 on M.*

Then the map $F_N : (N, J) \to \mathbb{C}^n$ defined by $F_N = F_M \circ F^{-1}$ is psc and $(F_N)_* \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(N, J) = \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}$.

Proof. From psc equivalence of (M, I) and (N, J) we have that there exists a smooth psc diffeomorphism $F : (M, I) \to (N, J)$ so that

$$F_* \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M, I) = \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(N, J),$$

Since F_M is an immersion of M into $\mathbb{C}^3$ and F is a diffeomorphism from M onto N, we have that $F_N = F_M \circ F^{-1}$ is an immersion of N into $\mathbb{C}^3$. Now F_N is a psc embedding, since

$$(F_N)_* \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(N, J) = \left((F_M)_* \circ F_*^{-1}\right) F_* \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M, I) = (F_M)_* \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M, I) = \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}.$$

This completes the proof. □

Corollary 2.11. *Let (M, I, J) be a 2–complex dimensional psc manifold with horizontal bundle $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M)$. If there exists a psc embedding $\iota : (M, I) \to \mathbb{C}^n$ so that $\iota_* \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M)$ constitutes a* CR *submanifold structure of codimension 2 of M, then there exists a psc embedding $j : (M, J) \to \mathbb{C}^n$ so that $j_* \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)} = \iota_* \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}$. Therefore, the* CR *submanifold structure of M may be identified to both* CR *structures arising from the psc structure of (M, I, J).*

2.2.4. *Strictly pseudoconformal diffeomorphisms and manifolds.* Among the class of psc diffeomorphisms we distinguish one which is defined as follows.

Definition 2.12. Let (M, I) and (N, J) be 2–dimensional complex manifolds which are psc equivalent via the psc diffeomorphism $F : (M, I) \to (N, J)$ and let $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M, I)$ be the horizontal bundle of (M, I). We assume additionally the existence of a 1–dimensional complex subbundle $\mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M, I)$ of $T^{(1,0)}(M, I)$ such that

i) $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M, I) \oplus \mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M, I) = T^{(1,0)}(M, I)$ and
ii) the F_*-image of $\mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M, I)$ is an 1–dimensional complex subbundle of $T^{(0,1)}(N, J)$.

Such an F shall be called *strictly pseudoconformal (spsc)*, the subbundle $\mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M, I)$ shall be called *vertical bundle* and the manifolds (M, I) and (N, J) shall be called *strictly pseudoconformally equivalent.*

Working analogously as in the previous paragraph, we can prove the counterparts of Proposition 2.3 and Corollary 2.8.

Proposition 2.13. *Let (M,I) and (N,J) be 2–dimensional complex manifolds. The smooth diffeomorphism $F:(M,I)\to(N,J)$ is strictly psc if and only if at each point $p\in M$ there exists a local representation $(z_1,z_2)\mapsto(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)$ of F, ((z_1,z_2) are local $J-$holomorphic coordinates around p and (ζ_1,ζ_2) are local $I-$holomorphic coordinates around $F(p)$), such that*

$$\operatorname{rank}(DF^{(1,0)})=\operatorname{rank}(DF^{(0,1)})=1,\quad DF^{(1,0)}=\begin{bmatrix}\frac{\partial\zeta_1}{\partial z_1} & \frac{\partial\zeta_2}{\partial z_1}\\ \\ \frac{\partial\zeta_2}{\partial z_1} & \frac{\partial\zeta_2}{\partial z_1}\end{bmatrix},\quad DF^{(0,1)}=\begin{bmatrix}\frac{\partial\overline{\zeta_1}}{\partial z_1} & \frac{\partial\overline{\zeta_2}}{\partial z_1}\\ \\ \frac{\partial\overline{\zeta_2}}{\partial z_1} & \frac{\partial\overline{\zeta_2}}{\partial z_1}\end{bmatrix}. \tag{2.4}$$

Equivalently,

$$\left|\frac{\partial(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)}{\partial(z_1,z_2)}\right|=\left|\frac{\partial(\overline{\zeta_1},\overline{\zeta_2})}{\partial(z_1,z_2)}\right|=0, \tag{2.5}$$

where the partial derivatives involved do not vanish simultaneously.

It is clear that Equation (2.5) is equivalent to

$$\left|\frac{\partial(z_1,z_2)}{\partial(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)}\right|=\left|\frac{\partial(\overline{z_1},\overline{z_2})}{\partial(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)}\right|=0.$$

It is natural to ask at this point under which conditions a psc diffeomorphism is also a spsc diffeomorphism. To this direction we have the following proposition.

Proposition 2.14. *Let $F:(M,I)\to(N,J)$ be a psc diffeomorphism. Suppose that there exist a holomorphic involution $\mathcal{T}_M$ of M and an antiholomorphic involution $\mathcal{T}_N$ of M such that $\mathcal{T}_N\circ F=F\circ\mathcal{T}_M$. Then F is spsc.*

Proof. If $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M,I)=\langle Z\rangle$ let $W=(\mathcal{T}_M)_*(Z)$. Since $\mathcal{T}_M$ is holomorphic, $W\in T^{(1,0)}(M,I)$. Let $\mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M,I)=\langle W\rangle$; since $\mathcal{T}_M$ is an involution,

$$\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M,I)\cap\mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M,I)=\emptyset$$

and $\{Z,W\}$ is a basis for $T^{(1,0)}(M,I)$. Moreover,

$$F_*(W)=(F_*\circ(\mathcal{T}_M)_*)(Z)=((\mathcal{T}_N)_*\circ F_*)(Z)=(\mathcal{T}_N)_*(F_*(Z))\in T^{(0,1)}(N,J).$$

□

We have mentioned in the previous section that in a psc manifold (M,I,J) we have an identification of complex structures I and J on the horizontal bundle $\mathcal{H}(M)$; in general, there is no information about the relation of I and J elsewhere on the tangent space of M. On the class of psc manifolds we are about to define, this relation is transparent.

A *strictly psc manifold* (M,I,J) is a psc manifold with the property that the identity mapping $id.:(M,I)\to(N,J)$ is strictly psc. In this case, besides the holomorphic identification of horizontal bundles there is an antiholomorphic identification of vertical bundles $\mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M,I)$ and $\mathcal{V}^{(0,1)}=id._*\mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}$ respectively. The resulting underlying real bundle shall be denoted by $\mathcal{V}(M)$. It is clear from the definition that in a spsc manifold, its complex structures I and J have the following properties:

(1) $I=J$ on $\mathcal{H}(M)$;
(2) $I=-J$ on $\mathcal{V}(M)$.

Proposition 2.15. *Let (M, I, J) be a psc manifold with complex structures J and I arising from the atlantes $\mathcal{A}_J = \{(U_j, \phi_j)\}$ and $\mathcal{A}_I = \{(V_i, \psi_i)\}$ respectively. Then (M, I, J) is strictly psc if and only if for each $p \in M$ there exist $(U_p, \phi_p) \in \mathcal{A}_J$ and $(V_p, \psi_p) \in \mathcal{A}_I$ so that the map $\psi \circ \phi^{-1} : \phi_p(U_p \cap V_p) \to \psi_p(U_p \cap V_p)$ is a strictly psc diffeomorphism. Explicitly, if $\phi_p : q \mapsto (\zeta_1, \zeta_2)$ for each $q \in U_p$ and $\psi_p : r \mapsto (z_1, z_2)$ for each $r \in V_p$ and $\psi \circ \phi^{-1}$ is given by $(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \mapsto (z_1, z_2)$ then Condition (2.5) holds.*

The existence of an involution of a certain kind in a psc manifold (M, I, J) ensures that it is also a spsc manifold.

Corollary 2.16. *Let (M, I, J) be a psc manifold and suppose that there exist an involution $\mathcal{T}$ of M which is $I-$holomorphic and $J-$antiholomorphic. Then (M, I, J) is a spsc manifold.*

Proof. The proof follows directly from Proposition 2.14. □

The next proposition is the spsc counterpart of Proposition 2.10.

Proposition 2.17. *Let M and N be 2–dimensional complex manifolds with complex structures J and I respectively, which are strictly pseudoconformally equivalent via the spsc map $F : (M, I) \to (N, J)$. We also suppose that there exists an antiholomorphic psc immersion $F_M : (M, I) \to \mathbb{C}^n$ so that*

$$(F_M)_* \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M, I) = \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}, \quad (F_M)_* \mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M, I) = \mathcal{V}^{\mathbb{C}},$$

and the underlying real subbundles $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ of $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}$ and $\mathcal{V}^{\mathbb{C}}$ respectively, form an antiholomorphic CR *submanifold structure of codimension 2 of M.*

Then the map $F_N : (N, J) \to \mathbb{C}^n$ defined by $F_N = F_M \circ F^{-1}$ is an antiholomorphic psc immersion and $(F_N)_* \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(N, J) = \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}$, $(F_N)_* \mathcal{V}^{(0,1)}(N, J) = \overline{\mathcal{V}^{\mathbb{C}}}$.

Proof. From spsc equivalence, there exists a smooth spsc diffeomorphism $F : (M, I) \to (N, J)$ so that

$$F_* \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M, I) = \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(N, J) \quad \text{and} \quad F_* \mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M, I) = \mathcal{V}^{(0,1)}(N, J),$$

where $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M, I)$, $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(N, J)$ are the horizontal bundles and $\mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M, I)$, $\mathcal{V}^{(0,1)}(N, J)$ are the vertical bundles of (M, I) and (N, J), respectively. We only have to prove the last equation and we do so by proving the equivalent relation:

$$(F_N)_* \mathcal{V}^{(0,1)}(N, J) = \mathcal{V}^{\mathbb{C}}.$$

We indeed have

$$(F_N)_* \mathcal{V}^{(0,1)}(N, J) = \left((F_M)_* \circ F_*^{-1}\right) F_* \mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M, I) = (F_M)_* \mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(M, I) = \mathcal{V}^{\mathbb{C}}$$

and the proof is complete. □

Corollary 2.18. *Let (M, I, J) be a 2–complex dimensional strictly psc manifold. If there exists an antiholomorphic psc embedding $\iota : (M, I) \to \mathbb{C}^n$ giving M the structure of an antiholomorphic* CR *submanifold of codimension 2, then there exists an antiholomorphic psc embedding $j : (M, J) \to \mathbb{C}^n$ which gives M the same antiholomorphic* CR *submanifold structure.*

3. Cross–Ratio Variety

This section contains a review of all well known results about Falbel's cross–ratio variety; the result of Theorem 3.9 is new. This review is quite extended, partly for clarity and partly due to the different conventions considered for $\mathfrak{X}$ in [6, 7]. As preliminaries to cross–ratio variety we discuss basic facts about complex hyperbolic plane and its boundary in Section 3.1. We define the cross–ratio variety $\mathfrak{X}$ and we discuss its relation with $\mathfrak{F}$, the $\mathrm{PU}(2,1)-$configuration space of four points in S^3 (Section 3.2). Singular sets and the involution $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathfrak{X}$ are in Sections 3.3 and 3.4, respectively. Manifold, CR and complex structures in $\mathfrak{X}$ are in Section 3.5.

3.1. **Preliminaries to Cross–Ratio Variety.** The material in this section is well known; for details we refer the reader to the standard book of Goldman [8]. Complex hyperbolic plane is treated in Section 3.1.1 and its boundary in Section 3.1.2. Definitions of Cartan's angular invariant and complex cross–ratio are in Section 3.1.3.

3.1.1. *Complex Hyperbolic Plane.* We consider $\mathbb{C}^{2,1}$, the vector space $\mathbb{C}^3$ with the Hermitian form of signature $(2,1)$ given by

$$\langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}\rangle = z_1\overline{w}_3 + z_2\overline{w}_2 + z_3\overline{w}_1,$$

and consider the following subspaces of $\mathbb{C}^{2,1}$:

$$V_- = \Big\{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^{2,1} \ : \ \langle \mathbf{z},\, \mathbf{z}\rangle < 0\Big\}, \quad V_0 = \Big\{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^{2,1} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} \ : \ \langle \mathbf{z},\, \mathbf{z}\rangle = 0\Big\}.$$

Denote by $\mathbb{P} : \mathbb{C}^{2,1} \setminus \{0\} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}P^2$ the canonical projection onto complex projective space. Then the *complex hyperbolic plane* $\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ is defined to be $\mathbb{P}V_-$ and its boundary $\partial\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ is $\mathbb{P}V_0$. Hence we have

$$\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}} = \left\{(z_1,\, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \ : \ 2\Re(z_1) + |z_2|^2 < 0\right\},$$

and in this manner, $\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ is the Siegel domain in $\mathbb{C}^2$.

There are two distinguished points in V_0 which we denote by $\mathbf{o}$ and ∞:

$$\mathbf{o} = \begin{bmatrix}0\\0\\1\end{bmatrix}, \quad \infty = \begin{bmatrix}1\\0\\0\end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{o} = o$ and $\mathbb{P}\infty = \infty$. Then

$$\partial\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \{\infty\} = \left\{(z_1,\, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \ : \ 2\Re(z_1) + |z_2|^2 = 0\right\},$$

and in particular, $o = (0,0) \in \mathbb{C}^2$.

Conversely, if we are given a point $z = (z_1, z_2)$ of $\mathbb{C}^2$, then the point

$$\mathbf{z} = \begin{bmatrix}z_1\\z_2\\1\end{bmatrix}.$$

is called the *standard lift* of z. Therefore the standard lifts of points of the complex hyperbolic plane and its boundary (except infinity) are vectors of V_- and V_0 respectively with the third inhomogeneous coordinate equal to 1.

$\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ is a Kähler manifold, its Kähler structure is given by the Bergman metric. The holomorphic sectional curvature equals to -1 and its real sectional curvature is pinched between -1 and $-1/4$. The full group of holomorphic isometries is the *projective unitary group*

$$\mathrm{PU}(2,1) = \mathrm{SU}(2,1)/\{I, \omega I, \omega^2 I\},$$

where ω is a non real cube root of unity (that is $\mathrm{SU}(2,1)$ is a 3-fold covering of $\mathrm{PU}(2,1)$). There are two ways (up to $\mathrm{PU}(2,1)$ conjugacy) to embed real hyperbolic plane into complex hyperbolic plane; that is, as $\mathbf{H}^1_{\mathbb{C}}$ as well as $\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{R}}$. These embeddings give rise to complex lines, i.e., isometric images of the embedding of $\mathbf{H}^1_{\mathbb{C}}$ into $\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ and Lagrangian planes, i.e., isometric images of $\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{R}}$ into $\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$, respectively.

3.1.2. *The boundary–Heisenberg group.* There is an identification of the boundary of the Siegel domain with the one point compactification of $\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{R}$: A finite point z in the boundary of the Siegel domain has a standard lift of the form

$$\mathbf{z} = \begin{bmatrix} -|z|^2 + it \\ \sqrt{2}z \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The unipotent stabiliser at infinity acts simply transitively and gives the set of these points the structure of a 2–step nilpotent Lie group, namely the Heisenberg group $\mathfrak{H}$. This is $\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{R}$ with group law:

$$(z,t)\star(w,s) = (z+w, t+s+2\Im(\overline{w}z)).$$

The Heisenberg norm (Korányi gauge) is given by

$$|(z,t)|_{\mathfrak{H}} = |\mathcal{A}(z,t)|^{1/2}, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{A}(z,t) = |z|^2 - it.$$

From this norm arises a metric, the Korányi–Cygan (K–C) metric, on $\mathfrak{H}$ by the relation

$$d_{\mathfrak{H}}\left((z,t),\,(w,s)\right) = \left|(z,t)^{-1}\star(w,s)\right|_{\mathfrak{H}}.$$

The K–C metric is invariant under

(1) the left action of $\mathfrak{H}$, $(z,t)\to(w,s)\star(z,t)$;
(2) the rotations $(z,t)\mapsto(ze^{i\phi},t)$, $\phi\in\mathbb{R}$.

These form the group $\mathrm{Isom}(\mathfrak{H},d_K)$ of *Heisenberg isometries*. The K–C metric is also scaled up to multiplicative constants by the action of Heisenberg dilations $(z,t)\mapsto(rz,r^2t)$, $r\in\mathbb{R}_*$ and there is also an inversion R, defined for each $p=(z,t)\in\mathfrak{H}$, $p\neq o$, by $(z,t)\mapsto\left(\frac{z}{-|z|^2+it},-\frac{t}{|-|z|^2+it|^2|}\right)$which satisfies

$$d_{\mathfrak{H}}(R(p),R(p')) = \frac{d_{\mathfrak{H}}(p,p')}{d_{\mathfrak{H}}(p,o)d_{\mathfrak{H}}(p',o)}.$$

All the above transformations are extended to infinity in the obvious way and the action of $\mathrm{PU}(2,1)$ on the boundary is given by compositions of these transformations.

$\mathbb{R}-$circles are boundaries of Lagrangian planes and $\mathbb{C}-$circles are boundaries of complex lines. They come in two flavours, infinite ones (i.e. containing the point at infinity) and finite ones. We refer to [8] for more more details about these curves.

3.1.3. *Invariants: Cartan's Angular Invariant and Complex Cross–Ratio.* Given a triple (p_1,p_2,p_3) of points at the boundary $\partial\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ the Cartan's angular invariant $\mathbb{A}(p_1,p_2,p_3)$ is defined by

$$\mathbb{A}(p_1,p_2,p_3) = \arg(-\langle\mathbf{p}_1,\mathbf{p}_2\rangle\langle\mathbf{p}_2,\mathbf{p}_3\rangle\langle\mathbf{p}_3,\mathbf{p}_1\rangle)$$

where $\mathbf{p}_i$ are lifts of p_i, $i=1,2,3$. The Cartan's angular invariant lies in $[-\pi/2,\pi/2]$, is independent of the choice of the lifts and remains invariant under the diagonal action of $\mathrm{PU}(2,1)$. Any other permutation of points produces angular invariants which differ from the above possibly up to sign. The following propositions are in [8] to which we also refer the reader for further details:

Proposition 3.1. *Let (p_1, p_2, p_3) be a triple of points lying in $\partial\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ and let also $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{A}(p_1, p_2, p_3)$ be their Cartan's angular invariant. Then*

(1) *All points lie in an $\mathbb{R}-$circle if and only if $\mathbb{A} = 0$.*
(2) *All points lie in a $\mathbb{C}-$circle if and only if $\mathbb{A} = \pm\pi/2$.*

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose that p_i and p'_i, $i = 1, 2, 3$, are points in $\partial\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$. If there exists a holomorphic isometry g of $\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ such that $g(p_i) = p'_i$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, then $\mathbb{A}(p_1, p_2, p_3) = \mathbb{A}(p'_1, p'_2, p'_3)$. Conversely, if $\mathbb{A}(p_1, p_2, p_3) = \mathbb{A}(p'_1, p'_2, p'_3)$, then there exists a holomorphic isometry g of $\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ such that $g(p_i) = p'_i$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. This isometry is unique unless p_i, $i = 1, 2, 3$, lie in a $\mathbb{C}-$circle.*

Given a quadruple of pairwise distinct points $\mathfrak{p} = (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4)$ in $\partial\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$, we define their complex cross–ratio as follows:

$$\mathbb{X}(p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4) = \frac{\langle \mathbf{p}_3, \mathbf{p}_1\rangle\langle \mathbf{p}_4, \mathbf{p}_2\rangle}{\langle \mathbf{p}_4, \mathbf{p}_1\rangle\langle \mathbf{p}_3, \mathbf{p}_2\rangle},$$

where $\mathbf{p}_i$ are lifts of p_i, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. The cross–ratio is independent of the choice of lifts and remains invariant under the diagonal action of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$. We stress here that for points in the Heisenberg group, the square root of its absolute value is

$$|\mathbb{X}(p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4)|^{1/2} = \frac{d_K(p_4, p_2) \cdot d_K(p_3, p_1)}{d_K(p_4, p_1) \cdot d_K(p_3, p_2)}.$$

3.2. **Cross–ratio variety and the configuration space.** Given a quadruple $\mathfrak{p} = (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4)$ of pairwise distinct points in the boundary $\partial\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$, all possible permutations of points gives us 24 complex cross–ratios corresponding to $\mathfrak{p}$. Due to symmetries, see [6], Falbel showed that all cross–ratios corresponding to a quadruple of points depend on three cross–ratios which satisfy two real equations. Indeed, the following proposition holds; for its proof, see for instance [13].

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\mathfrak{p} = (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4)$ be any quadruple of pairwise distinct points in $\partial\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$. Let*

$$\mathbb{X}_1(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathbb{X}(p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4), \quad \mathbb{X}_2(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathbb{X}(p_1, p_3, p_2, p_4), \quad \mathbb{X}_3(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathbb{X}(p_2, p_3, p_1, p_4).$$

Then

$$|\mathbb{X}_3|^2 = |\mathbb{X}_2|^2/|\mathbb{X}_1|^2, \tag{3.1}$$

$$2|\mathbb{X}_1|^2\Re(\mathbb{X}_3) = |\mathbb{X}_1|^2 + |\mathbb{X}_2|^2 - 2\Re(\mathbb{X}_1) - 2\Re(\mathbb{X}_2) + 1. \tag{3.2}$$

Definition 3.4. Equations (3.1) and (3.2) define a 4–dimensional real subvariety of $\mathbb{C}^3$ which we call the *cross–ratio variety* $\mathfrak{X}$.

We shall now discuss the relation between cross–ratio variety $\mathfrak{X}$ and $\mathfrak{F}$, the space of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ configurations of four points in S^3. The space $\mathfrak{F}$ consists of equivalence classes $[\mathfrak{p}]$, where $\mathfrak{p}$ is a quadruple of pairwise distinct points in $\partial\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$. Two quadruples $\mathfrak{p} = (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4)$ and $\mathfrak{p}' = (p'_1, p'_2, p'_3, p'_4)$ belong to the same equivalence class, if and only if there exists an element $g \in \mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ such that $g(p_j) = p'_j$ for each $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Consider the map $\varpi : \mathfrak{F} \to \mathfrak{X}$ given by

$$[\mathfrak{p}] \mapsto (\mathbb{X}_1(\mathfrak{p}), \mathbb{X}_2(\mathfrak{p}), \mathbb{X}_3(\mathfrak{p}))\,.$$

This map is a surjection as the following proposition (Proposition 5.5, [13]) shows.

Proposition 3.5. *Let x_1, x_2 and x_3 be three complex numbers satisfying*

$$|x_3|^2 = |x_2|^2/|x_1|^2 \quad \textit{and} \quad 2|x_1|^2\Re(x_3) = |x_1|^2 + |x_2|^2 - 2\Re(x_1) + \Re(x_2) + 1.$$

Then there exist a quadruple of points $\mathfrak{p} = (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4)$, $p_i \in \partial\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$, $i = 1, \ldots, 4$ so that

$$\mathbb{X}_1(\mathfrak{p}) = x_1, \quad \mathbb{X}_2(\mathfrak{p}) = x_2, \quad \mathbb{X}_3(\mathfrak{p}) = x_3.$$

By Proposition 5.10 of [13], the map ϖ is also 1–1 in a large subspace of $\mathfrak{F}$.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $\mathfrak{p} = (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4)$ and $\mathfrak{p}' = (p'_1, p'_2, p'_3, p'_4)$ be two quadruples of pairwise distinct points in $\partial\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ such that neither all p_i nor all p'_i lie in the same $\mathbb{C}-$circle. Then there exists an element $g \in \mathrm{PU}(2,1)$ such that $g(p_j) = p'_j$ for each $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$ if and only if $\mathbb{X}_i(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathbb{X}_i(\mathfrak{p}')$ for each $i = 1, 2, 3$.*

Therefore, to each point $[\mathfrak{p}]$ of $\mathfrak{F}$ such that not all p_i lie in a $\mathbb{C}-$circle, there is associated a unique point $\varpi(\mathfrak{p}) = (\mathbb{X}_1(\mathfrak{p}), \mathbb{X}_2(\mathfrak{p}), \mathbb{X}_3(\mathfrak{p}))$ of the cross–ratio variety $\mathfrak{X}$. In the degenerate case where all $p_i \in \mathfrak{p}$ lie in a $\mathbb{C}-$circle, surjection of ϖ still holds, but injection fails as this was shown in [4]. Following Lemma 5.5 of the corrected version of [6], the map ϖ is 2–1 from the space $\mathfrak{F}_{\mathbb{R}}$ of configurations of points lying in a $\mathbb{C}-$circle to a subset $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{R}}$ of $\mathfrak{X}$ called the *real singular set* of $\mathfrak{X}$, see (3.3) below. Besides $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{R}}$ there are also other singular sets which we are now about to discuss.

3.3. **Singular Sets.** The structures of the cross–ratio variety $\mathfrak{X}$ we study in this paper are not globally defined. There are singular sets; in this section we state the definitions of these sets and describe their properties in brief. For the proof of those properties as well as for a more detailed discussion on singular sets, see Section 6.2. We mentioned above the real singular set $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{R}}$, which is in 2–1 correspondence with the subset $\mathfrak{F}_{\mathbb{R}}$ of the configuration space consisting of classes of quadruples of points such that all lie in a $\mathbb{C}-$circle. It turns out that

$$\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{R}} = \left\{(\mathbb{X}_1, \mathbb{X}_2, \mathbb{X}_3) \in \mathfrak{X} \mid \mathbb{X}_i \in \mathbb{R},\ \mathbb{X}_1 + \mathbb{X}_2 = 1,\ \frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_2} + \frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_3} = 1,\ \mathbb{X}_3 + \frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_1} = 1\right\}. \tag{3.3}$$

As a manifold, $\mathbb{X}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is a straight line with two points removed. Next, we have the CR *singular set*:

$$\mathfrak{X}_{\mathrm{CR}} = \left\{(\mathbb{X}_1, \mathbb{X}_2, \mathbb{X}_3) \in \mathfrak{X} \mid\ \mathbb{X}_1 + \mathbb{X}_2 = 1,\ \frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_2} + \frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_3} = 1,\ \mathbb{X}_3 + \frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_1} = 1\right\}. \tag{3.4}$$

$\mathfrak{X}_{\mathrm{CR}}$ is the singular set of the codimension 2 CR submanifold structure of $\mathfrak{X}$. This set is a 1–dimensional complex manifold biholomorphic to $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ and it is in 1–1 correspondence with the subset $\mathfrak{F}_{\mathbb{CR}}$ of the configuration space which consists of equivalence classes of quadruples $\mathfrak{p} = (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4)$ such that p_1, p_2, p_3 lie in a $\mathbb{C}-$circle. Finally, we consider the *complex singular set*:

$$\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{C}} = \{(\mathbb{X}_1, \mathbb{X}_2, \mathbb{X}_3) \in \mathfrak{X} \mid \Im(\mathbb{X}_3) = 0\}. \tag{3.5}$$

The complex structures of $\mathfrak{X}$ we study here, see Sections 3.6 and 4.1, may be defined away from $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{C}}$; this fact justifies the name *complex singular set*. $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is in 1–1 correspondence with the subset $\mathfrak{F}_{\mathbb{C}}$ of $\mathfrak{F}$ consisting of equivalence classes of quadruples $\mathfrak{p} = (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4)$ such that p_2, p_3 lie in the same orbit of the stabiliser of p_1, p_4. $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{C}}$ has a rich structures itself; besides being a subset of dimension one, it can be endowed with the structure of a 3–dimensional submanifold of $\mathbb{C}^2$. Additionally, it has a CR structure of codimension 1 which is simply the restriction of the CR structure of $\mathfrak{X}$ in $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{CR}}$.

Besides the above singular sets, we are going to consider another one which is obtained by a natural involution of $\mathfrak{X}$.

3.4. **The Involution $\mathcal{T}$.** We introduce the involution $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathfrak{X}$; this is given by

$$\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{X}_1,\mathbb{X}_2,\mathbb{X}_3)=\left(\mathbb{X}_1,\mathbb{X}_2,\overline{\mathbb{X}_3}\right),\quad (\mathbb{X}_1,\mathbb{X}_2,\mathbb{X}_3)\in\mathfrak{X}. \tag{3.6}$$

This involution is studied extensively in Section 5. Here, we remark that clearly $\mathcal{T}$ leaves pointwise fixed the singular set $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{C}}$. Moreover, the antiholomorphic nature of the CR structure we define in 3.5.2 arises from $\mathcal{T}$.

For the moment, we focus on the $\mathcal{T}-$image of the singular set $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathrm{CR}}$. This is the set

$$\mathfrak{X}^*_{\mathrm{CR}}=\left\{(\mathbb{X}_1,\mathbb{X}_2,\mathbb{X}_3)\in\mathfrak{X}\mid\ \mathbb{X}_1+\mathbb{X}_2=1,\ \frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_2}+\frac{1}{\overline{\mathbb{X}_3}}=1,\ \overline{\mathbb{X}_3}+\frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_1}=1\right\}. \tag{3.7}$$

We show in Section 6.2 that $\mathfrak{X}^*_{\mathrm{CR}}$ is isomorphic to the subset of $\mathfrak{F}$ consisting of classes of quadruples $\mathfrak{p}=(p_1,p_2,p_3,p_4)$ such that p_2,p_3,p_4 lie in a $\mathbb{C}-$circle. As a manifold, it is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathrm{CR}}$ and it is also quite obvious that

$$\mathfrak{X}_{\mathrm{CR}}\cap\mathfrak{X}^*_{\mathrm{CR}}=\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

3.5. **Manifold,** CR **and Complex Structures.** We consider the following subsets of $\mathfrak{X}$.

$$\mathfrak{X}'=\mathfrak{X}\setminus\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{R}}, \tag{3.8}$$

$$\mathfrak{X}''=\mathfrak{X}\setminus\mathfrak{X}_{\mathrm{CR}}, \tag{3.9}$$

$$\mathfrak{X}^*=\mathfrak{X}'\setminus\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{C}}. \tag{3.10}$$

It has been proven in [7] that:

(1) $\mathfrak{X}'$ is a 4–dimensional real submanifold of $\mathbb{C}^3$,
(2) $\mathfrak{X}''$ is a codimension 2 CR submanifold of $\mathbb{C}^3$ and
(3) $\mathfrak{X}^*$ is a 2–complex dimensional complex manifold.

Below we are going to reprove these results, see Theorems 3.7, 3.8 and 3.10, respectively. There is also a new result here: the CR structure is antiholomorphic, see Theorem 3.9.

3.5.1. *Manifold structure.*

Theorem 3.7. *The subset $\mathfrak{X}'=\mathfrak{X}\setminus\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{R}}$, where $\mathfrak{X}'$ and $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{R}}$ are as in (3.8) and (3.3) respectively, can be endowed with a structure of a 4–dimensional smooth real regular submanifold of $\mathbb{C}^3$.*

Proof. The proof is computational; one considers the equations defining $\mathfrak{X}$, those are rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}F_1(\zeta_1,\zeta_2,\zeta_3)&=|\zeta_2|^2-|\zeta_1|^2|\zeta_3|^2=0,\\ F_2(\zeta_1,\zeta_2,\zeta_3)&=|\zeta_1|^2+|\zeta_2|^2-2\Re(\zeta_1+\zeta_2)+1-2|\zeta_1|^2\Re(\zeta_3)=0,\end{aligned}$$

where $\zeta_i=x_i+iy_i$, and calculates the rank of the Jacobian matrix

$$D=\begin{bmatrix}\frac{\partial F_1}{\partial x_1} & \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial x_2} & \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial x_3} & \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial y_1} & \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial y_2} & \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial y_3}\\ \\ \frac{\partial F_2}{\partial x_1} & \frac{\partial F_2}{\partial x_2} & \frac{\partial F_2}{\partial x_3} & \frac{\partial F_2}{\partial y_1} & \frac{\partial F_2}{\partial y_2} & \frac{\partial F_2}{\partial y_3}\end{bmatrix},$$

at points of $\mathfrak{X}$. From the 2×2 minor subdeterminants it eventually turns out that the rank is 2 everywhere except at points of $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{R}}$. The result now follows from the regular level set theorem. □

We stress here that $\mathfrak{X}'$ is maximal in the following sense: the diagonal action of $\mathrm{PU}(2,1)$ is free on $\mathfrak{F}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and not free on the subset $\mathfrak{F}'=\mathfrak{F}\setminus\mathfrak{F}_{\mathbb{R}}$ of the configuration space $\mathfrak{F}$. Therefore a natural (with respect to the group action) manifold structure can be given only in open subsets of $\mathfrak{F}'$. Maximality now is in the sense that in fact $\mathfrak{F}'$ is in bijection with $\mathfrak{X}'$ and thus inherits a manifold structure itself which is exactly the one defined in Theorem 3.7. For details about the group action, see [7].

3.5.2. CR *structure.*

Theorem 3.8. *There is a* CR *structure of codimension 2 defined on* $\mathfrak{X}$. *Its singular set is* $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathrm{CR}}$.

Proof. Consider the defining equations 3.1 and 3.2 of $\mathfrak{X}$. Following the discussion in Section 2.1, we examine whether the matrix

$$D^{(1,0)} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial \zeta_1} & \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial \zeta_2} & \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial \zeta_3} \\ \\ \frac{\partial F_2}{\partial \zeta_1} & \frac{\partial F_2}{\partial \zeta_2} & \frac{\partial F_2}{\partial \zeta_3} \end{bmatrix}$$

has rank 2. Calculating the 2×2 minor subdeterminants $D_{\zeta_i,\zeta_j} = \left|\frac{\partial(F_1,F_2)}{\partial(\zeta_i,\zeta_j)}\right|$ at points of $\mathfrak{X}$ we obtain

$$D_{\zeta_2,\zeta_3} = \frac{|\zeta_2|^2}{|\zeta_3|^2}\left(\overline{\zeta_2\zeta_3} - \overline{\zeta_2} - \overline{\zeta_3}\right), \tag{3.11}$$

$$D_{\zeta_3,\zeta_1} = \overline{\zeta_3}|\zeta_1|^2\left(1 + \overline{\zeta_1\zeta_3} - \overline{\zeta_1}\right), \tag{3.12}$$

$$D_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2} = \frac{\overline{\zeta_2}}{\zeta_1}\left(1 - \overline{\zeta_1} - \overline{\zeta_2}\right). \tag{3.13}$$

The $(1,0)-$vector field of $\mathbb{C}^3$

$$Z = D_{\zeta_2,\zeta_3}\frac{\partial}{\partial\zeta_1} + D_{\zeta_3,\zeta_1}\frac{\partial}{\partial\zeta_2} + D_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\zeta_3},$$

defined at points of $\mathfrak{X}''$, is the generator of $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}$, that is, $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)} = \langle Z\rangle$. The singular set $\mathcal{S}$ of $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}$ comprises points of $\mathfrak{X}'$ at which Z is identically zero; it is clear that this happens only at points of $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathrm{CR}}$ and the proof is complete. □

Theorem 3.9. *The* CR *structure of Theorem 3.8 is that of an antiholomorphic* CR *submanifold of* $\mathbb{C}^3$.

Proof. Consider the involution $\mathcal{T}$ as in (3.6) and let $W = \mathcal{T}_*(Z)$. If $\omega = (\mathbb{X}_1, \mathbb{X}_2, \mathbb{X}_3) \in \mathfrak{X}$ we have

$$W_\omega = \mathcal{T}_*(Z)_\omega = \left(\mathcal{T}_{*,\mathcal{T}^{-1}(\omega)}\right) Z_{\mathcal{T}^{-1}(\omega)}$$

and thus

$$W = D_{\zeta_2,\overline{\zeta_3}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\zeta_1} + D_{\overline{\zeta_3},\zeta_1}\frac{\partial}{\partial\zeta_2} + D_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{\zeta_3}}.$$

The vector field W is by definition in $T(\mathfrak{X}')$ and is nowhere zero at points of $\mathfrak{X}\setminus\mathfrak{X}^*_{\mathrm{CR}}$. We write

$$Z = \frac{1}{2}\left(X - i\mathbb{J}X\right), \quad W = \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathcal{T}_*(X) - i\mathcal{T}_*(\mathbb{J}X)\right) = \frac{1}{2}\left(U - iV\right),$$

where $\mathbb{J}$ is the natural complex structure of $\mathbb{C}^3$. Let also $\mathcal{H} = \{X, Y = \mathbb{J}X\}$ and $\mathcal{V} = \{U, V\}$; clearly $\mathcal{H}\cap\mathcal{V} = \{0\}$. From this, we also have that $\{X, Y, U, V\}$ is a basis for $\mathcal{H}\oplus\mathcal{V}$.

Finally, we show that $\mathbb{J}\mathcal{V}\cap T(\mathfrak{X}') = \{0\}$. Indeed, for $i = 1, 2$ relations $dF_i(\mathbb{J}U) = 0$ would imply $U - i\mathbb{J}U \in \mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}$ and therefore $U\in\mathcal{H}$, a contradiction. In the same manner we prove that $\mathbb{J}V$ is not in the tangent space and the proof is complete.

□

The above antiholomorphic CR submanifold structure of cross–ratio variety makes sense away from points of $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathrm{CR}}\cup\mathfrak{X}^*_{\mathrm{CR}}$. In Section 6.2 we show that this set is isomorphic with the subset of the configuration space $\mathfrak{F}$ consisting of quadruples $\mathfrak{p} = (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4)$ such that either p_1, p_2, p_3 or p_2, p_3, p_4 lie in the same $\mathbb{C}-$circle.

To complete this section, we calculate the Levi form $L = (L_1, L_2)$ of the above defined CR structure. After elementary calculations we find:

$$L_1 = |D_{\zeta_3,\zeta_1}|^2 - |\zeta_1 D_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2} + \zeta_3 D_{\zeta_2,\zeta_3}|^2,$$
$$L_2 = (1 - 2\Re(\zeta_3))|D_{\zeta_2,\zeta_3}|^2 + |D_{\zeta_3,\zeta_1}|^2 - 2\Re(\overline{\zeta_1} D_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2} D_{\overline{\zeta_2},\overline{\zeta_3}}).$$

The following symmetric condition holds:

$$\frac{1}{\zeta_1} D_{\zeta_2,\zeta_3} - \frac{1}{\zeta_2} D_{\zeta_3,\zeta_1} + \frac{1}{\zeta_3} D_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2} = 0.$$

Using this, as well as the defining equations (3.1) and (3.2) of $\mathfrak{X}$, we deduce after elementary calculations that

$$L_1 \equiv 0, \quad L_2 = |\zeta_1|^2 |\zeta_2 - \zeta_3 \zeta_1|^2.$$

At points of $\mathfrak{X}''$ we have $L_2 > 0$. Indeed, the only case where $L_2 = 0$ is when $\zeta_2 = \zeta_3\zeta_1$. But this happens only at points of $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathrm{CR}}$, see Proposition 4.4 of [7].

3.6. **Complex Structure J.** The first one of the complex structures of $\mathfrak{X}^*$ we encounter in this work is revealed in the following theorem which has been proved in [7]. For clarity, we repeat here the proof.

Theorem 3.10. *The set $\mathfrak{X}^*$ can be endowed with the structure of a 2–complex dimensional complex manifold. With this structure $\mathfrak{X}^*$ is biholomorphic to $\mathbb{C}P^1 \times (\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R})$.*

Proof. Pick a point $(\mathbb{X}_1, \mathbb{X}_2, \mathbb{X}_3) \in \mathfrak{X}^*$ and consider the unique class $[\mathfrak{p}]$ of quadruples $\mathfrak{p} = (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4)$ such that $\mathbb{X}_i(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathbb{X}_i$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. We normalise so that

$$p_1 = (z_1, t_1), \quad p_2 = \infty, \quad p_3 = (0, 0), \quad p_4 = (z_4, t_4), \quad |z_1| + |z_4| \neq 0.$$

We have

$$\mathbb{X}_1 = \frac{-|z_1|^2 - it_1}{-|z_1|^2 - |z_4|^2 + i(t_4 - t_1) + 2\overline{z_1} z_4},$$
$$\mathbb{X}_2 = \frac{-|z_4|^2 + it_4}{-|z_1|^2 - |z_4|^2 + i(t_4 - t_1) + 2\overline{z_1} z_4},$$
$$\mathbb{X}_3 = \frac{-|z_4|^2 + it_4}{-|z_1|^2 + it_1},$$

and the map

$$\mathcal{N} : \mathfrak{X}^* \ni (\mathbb{X}_1, \mathbb{X}_2, \mathbb{X}_3) \mapsto \left([z_1, z_4], \frac{|z_4|^2 - it_4}{|z_1|^2 - it_1} \right) \in \mathbb{C}P^1 \times (\mathbb{C} - \mathbb{R})$$

is a homeomorphism; with brackets we denote homogeneous coordinates in $\mathbb{C}P^1$. To define an atlas, we first observe that

$$z = \frac{z_1}{z_4} = \frac{\mathbb{X}_1 + \mathbb{X}_2/\mathbb{X}_3}{\mathbb{X}_1 + \mathbb{X}_2 - 1}, \quad w = \frac{|z_4|^2 - it_4}{|z_1|^2 - it_1} = \mathbb{X}_3,$$

(the right equation is obvious; the left is obtained by straightforward calculations). Hence by considering $\mathcal{N}_0 : \mathfrak{X}^* \to \mathbb{C}P^1 \times (\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R})$ and $\mathcal{N}_\infty : \mathfrak{X}^* \to \mathbb{C}P^1 \times (\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R})$ given respectively by

$$\mathcal{N}_0(\mathbb{X}_1, \mathbb{X}_2, \mathbb{X}_3) = (z, w), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N}_\infty(\mathbb{X}_1, \mathbb{X}_2, \mathbb{X}_3) = (1/z, w),$$

we obtain an atlas $\mathcal{A}_J$ for $\mathfrak{X}^*$, consisting of the charts $(\mathfrak{X}^*, \mathcal{N}_0)$ and $(\mathfrak{X}^*, \mathcal{N}_\infty)$. Moreover, the complex manifold structure of $\mathfrak{X}^*$ which we shall denote by J, arises from this atlas.

□

Corollary 3.11. *The involution $\mathcal{T}$ of Equation (3.6) is an antiholomorphic mapping of the complex manifold $(\mathfrak{X}^*, J)$.*

Proof. One verifies that the coordinate expression of $\mathcal{T}$ is

$$(z, w) \mapsto \left(\frac{1}{\overline{wz}}, \overline{w}\right),$$

which is clearly antiholomorphic. □

4. Pseudoconformality of Cross–Ratio Variety

In this section we prove that away from certain singular sets, the cross–ratio variety can be given a psc as well as a spsc structure. In Section 4.1 we define the second complex operator for $\mathfrak{X}^*$ and finally in Section 4.2 we prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, respectively.

4.1. **Complex Structure I.** Let

$$\mathfrak{X}^*_+ = \{(\mathbb{X}_1, \mathbb{X}_2, \mathbb{X}_3) \in \mathfrak{X}^* \mid \Im(\mathbb{X}_3) > 0\}, \quad \mathfrak{X}^*_- = \{(\mathbb{X}_1, \mathbb{X}_2, \mathbb{X}_3) \in \mathfrak{X}^* \mid \Im(\mathbb{X}_3) < 0\}.$$

We consider the subset $\mathcal{P}$ of $\mathbb{C}^2$ defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{P} = \left\{(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid \ (|\zeta_1| - |\zeta_2|)^2 < 2\Re(\zeta_1) + 2\Re(\zeta_2) - 1\right\}.$$

The set $\mathcal{P}$ is a *Levi strictly pseudoconvex domain*; the proof of this lies in Proposition 6.8.

We have the following Lemma:

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{M} : \mathfrak{X} \to \mathbb{C}^2$ be the projection*

$$\mathfrak{X} \ni (\mathbb{X}_1, \mathbb{X}_2, \mathbb{X}_3) \mapsto (\mathbb{X}_1, \mathbb{X}_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2,$$

and denote by $\mathcal{M}_\pm$ the restrictions of $\mathcal{M}$ to $\mathfrak{X}^*_\pm$ respectively. Then, $\mathcal{M}_\pm$ are bijections of $\mathfrak{X}^*_\pm$ onto $\mathcal{P}$. If $(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \in \mathcal{P}$, then

$$\mathcal{M}_\pm^{-1}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) = \left(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \frac{|\zeta_2|}{|\zeta_1|} e^{\pm i\theta}\right) \in \mathfrak{X}^*_\pm, \tag{4.1}$$

where

$$\theta = \arccos\left(\frac{|\zeta_1|^2 + |\zeta_2|^2 - 2\Re(\zeta_1) - 2\Re(\zeta_2) + 1}{2|\zeta_1||\zeta_2|}\right). \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. Let $(\mathbb{X}_1, \mathbb{X}_2, \mathbb{X}_3)$ be any point in $\mathfrak{X}^*$. Since $\Im(\mathbb{X}_3) \neq 0$, from the obvious inequality

$$-|\mathbb{X}_3| < \Re(\mathbb{X}_3) < |\mathbb{X}_3|$$

and Equation (3.2) we get

$$(|\mathbb{X}_1| - |\mathbb{X}_2|)^2 < 2\Re(\mathbb{X}_1) + 2\Re(\mathbb{X}_2) - 1 < (|\mathbb{X}_1| + |\mathbb{X}_2|)^2,$$

where the right inequality holds trivially. Thus $\mathcal{M}_\pm(\mathfrak{X}^*_\pm) \subseteq \mathcal{P}$. Moreover θ is well defined, that is,

$$-1 < \frac{|\zeta_1|^2 + |\zeta_2|^2 - 2\Re(\zeta_1) - 2\Re(\zeta_2) + 1}{2|\zeta_1||\zeta_2|} < 1.$$

Writing

$$\mathbb{X}_1 = \zeta_1, \quad \mathbb{X}_2 = \zeta_2, \quad \mathbb{X}_3 = \frac{|\zeta_2|}{|\zeta_1|} e^{\pm i\theta},$$

we have $\Im(\mathbb{X}_3) \neq 0$, $|\mathbb{X}_2| = |\mathbb{X}_1||\mathbb{X}_3|$ and

$$\begin{aligned} 2|\mathbb{X}_1|^2\Re(\mathbb{X}_3) &= 2|\mathbb{X}_1||\mathbb{X}_2|\cos\theta \\ &= |\zeta_1|^2 + |\zeta_2|^2 - 2\Re(\zeta_1) - 2\Re(\zeta_2) + 1 \\ &= |\mathbb{X}_1|^2 + |\mathbb{X}_2|^2 - 2\Re(\mathbb{X}_1) - 2\Re(\mathbb{X}_2) + 1. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. □

Theorem 4.2. *The set $\mathfrak{X}^*$ can be endowed with the structure of a disconnected 2–complex dimensional complex manifold. The respective complex analytic atlas $\mathcal{A}_I$ consists of the two non overlapping charts*

$$(\mathfrak{X}^*_+, \mathcal{M}_+) \quad \textit{and} \quad (\mathfrak{X}^*_-, \mathcal{M}_-),$$

where $\mathcal{M}_\pm$ are the restrictions of $\mathcal{M}$ to $\mathfrak{X}^*_\pm$, respectively. In this manner, the complex structure in both $\mathfrak{X}^*_+$ and $\mathfrak{X}^*_-$ is that of $\mathcal{P}$.

The atlas $\mathcal{A}_I$ of Theorem 4.2 helps us to visualise the subset $\mathfrak{X}^*$ of $\mathfrak{X}$ as a disconnected set comprising of two 4–dimensional connected components, i.e., the sets $\mathfrak{X}^+$ and $\mathfrak{X}^-$. Both these sets are identified biholomorphically to $\mathcal{P}$. From now on, the complex structure of $\mathfrak{X}^*$ induced from the complex analytic atlas above, will be denoted by I.

Corollary 4.3. *The involution $\mathcal{T}$ given by Equation (3.6) is a holomorphic mapping of the complex manifold $(\mathfrak{X}^*, I)$.*

Proof. The coordinate expression for $\mathcal{T}$ is $(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \mapsto (\zeta_1, \zeta_2)$. □

4.2. **Proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.** In this section we are going to prove both Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. For the proof we need a series of lemmas.

Lemma 4.4. *The manifold $(\mathfrak{X}^*, I, J)$ is pseudoconformal with singular set $\mathfrak{X}_{\rm CR} \cap \mathfrak{X}^*$.*

Proof. We prove that the identity map $id : (\mathfrak{X}^*, I) \to (\mathfrak{X}^*, J)$ is psc. Working in the coordinate charts $(\mathfrak{X}^+, \mathcal{M}^+)$ and $(\mathfrak{X}^*, \mathcal{N}_0)$, we have the following representation of the identity map:

$$(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \quad \mapsto \quad (z, w) = \left(\frac{\zeta_1 + \zeta_2/\zeta_3}{\zeta_1 + \zeta_2 - 1} \, , \, \zeta_3 \right),$$

where $\zeta_3 = \frac{|\zeta_2|}{|\zeta_1|} e^{i\theta}$ with θ as defined in Equation (4.2). From Corollary 2.8 and Proposition 2.9 we only have to prove

$$Did.^{(0,1)} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \overline{z}}{\partial \zeta_1} & \frac{\partial \overline{z}}{\partial \zeta_2} \\ \\ \frac{\partial \overline{w}}{\partial \zeta_1} & \frac{\partial \overline{w}}{\partial \zeta_2} \end{bmatrix} = 0.$$

Calculating straightforwardly we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial \overline{z}}{\partial \zeta_1} = -\frac{\overline{\zeta_2}/\overline{\zeta_3}^2}{\overline{\zeta_1} + \overline{\zeta_2} - 1} \cdot \frac{\partial \overline{\zeta_3}}{\partial \zeta_1}, \quad \frac{\partial \overline{z}}{\partial \zeta_2} = -\frac{\overline{\zeta_2}/\overline{\zeta_3}^2}{\overline{\zeta_1} + \overline{\zeta_2} - 1} \cdot \frac{\partial \overline{\zeta_3}}{\partial \zeta_2}, \\ &\frac{\partial \overline{w}}{\partial \zeta_1} = \frac{\partial \overline{\zeta_3}}{\partial \zeta_1}, \quad \frac{\partial \overline{w}}{\partial \zeta_2} = \frac{\partial \overline{\zeta_3}}{\partial \zeta_2}. \end{aligned}$$

To calculate the partial derivatives $\partial\overline{\zeta_3}/\partial\zeta_i$, $i=1,2$ we take partial derivatives with respect to ζ_1 and ζ_2 in the equations

$$|\zeta_3|^2=\frac{|\zeta_2|^2}{|\zeta_1|^2},$$
$$2|\zeta_1|^2\Re(\zeta_3)=|\zeta_1|^2+|\zeta_2|^2-2\Re(\zeta_1+\zeta_2)+1.$$

We find the implicit expressions:

$$\frac{\partial\overline{\zeta_3}}{\partial\zeta_1}=-\frac{\overline{\zeta_3}(\overline{\zeta_1}-\overline{\zeta_1\zeta_3}-1)}{2i\Im(\zeta_3)\cdot|\zeta_1|^2}=\frac{D_{\zeta_3,\zeta_1}}{2i\Im(\zeta_3)\cdot|\zeta_1|^4},\quad \frac{\partial\overline{\zeta_3}}{\partial\zeta_2}=\frac{\overline{\zeta_2}+\overline{\zeta_3}-\overline{\zeta_2\zeta_3}}{2i\Im(\zeta_3)\cdot|\zeta_1|^2}=-\frac{D_{\zeta_2,\zeta_3}}{2i\Im(\zeta_3)\cdot|\zeta_1|^4}. \tag{4.3}$$

For furter use we shall also need the expressions:

$$\frac{\partial\zeta_3}{\partial\zeta_1}=\frac{\zeta_3(\overline{\zeta_1}-\overline{\zeta_1}\zeta_3-1)}{2i\Im(\zeta_3)\cdot|\zeta_1|^2}=-\frac{D_{\overline{\zeta_3},\zeta_1}}{2i\Im(\zeta_3)\cdot|\zeta_1|^4},\quad \frac{\partial\zeta_3}{\partial\zeta_2}=-\frac{\zeta_3+\overline{\zeta_2}-\zeta_3\overline{\zeta_2}}{2i\Im(\zeta_3)\cdot|\zeta_1|^2}=\frac{D_{\zeta_2,\overline{\zeta_3}}}{2i\Im(\zeta_3)\cdot|\zeta_1|^4}.$$

Here D_{ζ_2,ζ_3}, D_{ζ_3,ζ_1} are as in Equations (3.11) and (3.12), respectively. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}\det\left(Did.^{(0,1)}\right) &= \frac{\partial\overline{\zeta_3}}{\partial\zeta_1}\cdot\frac{\partial\overline{\zeta_3}}{\partial\zeta_2}\cdot\begin{vmatrix}-\frac{\overline{\zeta_2}/\overline{\zeta_3}^2}{\overline{\zeta_1}+\overline{\zeta_2}-1} & -\frac{\overline{\zeta_2}/\overline{\zeta_3}^2}{\overline{\zeta_1}+\overline{\zeta_2}-1}\\ 1 & 1\end{vmatrix}\\ &=0.\end{aligned}$$

We conclude the proof by remarking that from Equations (4.3) we also have that the bundle $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(\mathfrak{X}^*,I)$ is generated by the vector field

$$Z^I=D_{\zeta_2,\zeta_3}\frac{\partial}{\partial\zeta_1}+D_{\zeta_3,\zeta_1}\frac{\partial}{\partial\zeta_2}, \tag{4.4}$$

away from points of $\mathfrak{X}^*\cap\mathfrak{X}_{\mathrm{CR}}$. □

Lemma 4.5. *The psc structure of $(\mathfrak{X}^*,I,J)$ is spsc with singular set $(\mathfrak{X}_{\mathrm{CR}}\cup\mathfrak{X}^*_{\mathrm{CR}})\cap\mathfrak{X}^*$.*

Proof. Since the involution $\mathcal{T}$ is $I-$holomorphic and $J-$antiholomorphic, by Corollary 2.16 the psc structure is spsc: The vertical bundle $\mathcal{V}^{(1,0)}(\mathfrak{X}^*,I)$ is generated by the vector field

$$W^I=\mathcal{T}_*(Z^I)=D_{\zeta_2,\overline{\zeta_3}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\zeta_1}+D_{\overline{\zeta_3},\zeta_1}\frac{\partial}{\partial\zeta_2}, \tag{4.5}$$

away from points of $\mathfrak{X}^*\cap\mathfrak{X}^*_{\mathrm{CR}}$. □

Lemma 4.6. *The following hold:*

1. *$(\mathfrak{X}^*,I)$ is a pseudoconformal submanifold of $\mathbb{C}^3$ with singular set $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathrm{CR}}\cap\mathfrak{X}^*$.*
2. *This psc structure is antiholomorphic with singular set $(\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{CR}}\cup\mathfrak{X}^*_{\mathrm{CR}})\cap\mathfrak{X}^*$.*
3. *The induced* CR *and antiholomorphic* CR *submanifold structure coincide with the* CR *and antiholomorphic* CR *structure respectively, defined in Section 3.5.2 for the set $\mathfrak{X}''$.*

Proof. To prove (1), we consider the inclusion map $\iota:(\mathfrak{X}^*,I)\hookrightarrow\mathbb{C}^3$; this is given in the chart $(\mathfrak{X}^*_+,\mathcal{M}_+)$ by

$$\iota(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)=\left(\zeta_1,\zeta_2,\frac{|\zeta_2|}{|\zeta_1|}e^{i\theta}\right)=(\xi_1,\xi_2,\xi_3).$$

We will show first that $\iota_*\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(M,I)$ is the restriction to $\mathfrak{X}^*$ of the CR structure defined in Section 3.5.2. One checks that

$$D\iota^{(0,1)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ \frac{\partial\overline{\xi_3}}{\partial\zeta_1} & \frac{\partial\overline{\xi_3}}{\partial\zeta_2} \end{bmatrix}$$

is clearly of rank 1, except at points where the partial derivatives of $\overline{\xi_3}$ vanish. From Equations (4.3) we have that this happens at points of $\mathfrak{X}^* \cap \mathfrak{X}_{\mathrm{CR}}$ and thus ι is psc away from points of this set.

Recall from the proof of Lemma 4.4 that $\mathcal{H}^{(1,0)}(\mathfrak{X}^*, I)$ is spanned in the chart $(\mathfrak{X}^+, \mathcal{M}^+)$ by the vector field Z^I, where Z^I is as in Equation (4.4). Using Equations (3.11), (3.12) and (3.13) as well as Equations (4.3) and (4.4) we may verify the formulae:

$$\frac{\partial\xi_3}{\partial\zeta_1}D_{\zeta_2,\zeta_3} + \frac{\partial\xi_3}{\partial\zeta_2}D_{\zeta_3,\zeta_1} = D_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2}, \tag{4.6}$$

$$\frac{\partial\overline{\xi_3}}{\partial\zeta_1}D_{\zeta_2,\zeta_3} + \frac{\partial\overline{\xi_3}}{\partial\zeta_2}D_{\zeta_3,\zeta_1} = 0. \tag{4.7}$$

We next calculate:

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_*Z^I &= D_{\zeta_2,\zeta_3}\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi_1} + D_{\zeta_3,\zeta_1}\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi_2} + \left(\frac{\partial\xi_3}{\partial\zeta_1}D_{\zeta_2,\zeta_3} + \frac{\partial\xi_3}{\partial\zeta_2}D_{\zeta_3,\zeta_1}\right)\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi_3} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\partial\overline{\xi_3}}{\partial\zeta_1}D_{\zeta_2,\zeta_3} + \frac{\partial\overline{\xi_3}}{\partial\zeta_2}D_{\zeta_3,\zeta_1}\right)\frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{\xi_3}} \\ \text{using (4.6) and (4.7)} &= D_{\zeta_2,\zeta_3}\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi_1} + D_{\zeta_3,\zeta_1}\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi_2} + D_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi_3}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves our assertion. To prove (2) and (3) we consider the vector field W^I as in (4.5). The following relations hold:

$$\frac{\partial\xi_3}{\partial\zeta_1}D_{\zeta_2,\overline{\zeta_3}} + \frac{\partial\xi_3}{\partial\zeta_2}D_{\overline{\zeta_3},\zeta_1} = 0, \tag{4.8}$$

$$\frac{\partial\overline{\xi_3}}{\partial\zeta_1}D_{\zeta_2,\overline{\zeta_3}} + \frac{\partial\overline{\xi_3}}{\partial\zeta_2}D_{\overline{\zeta_3},\zeta_1} = D_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2}. \tag{4.9}$$

We therefore have:

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_*W^I &= D_{\zeta_2,\overline{\zeta_3}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi_1} + D_{\overline{\zeta_3},\zeta_1}\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi_2} + \left(\frac{\partial\xi_3}{\partial\zeta_1}D_{\zeta_2,\overline{\zeta_3}} + \frac{\partial\xi_3}{\partial\zeta_2}D_{\overline{\zeta}_3,\zeta_1}\right)\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi_3} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\partial\overline{\xi_3}}{\partial\zeta_1}D_{\zeta_2,\overline{\zeta_3}} + \frac{\partial\overline{\xi_3}}{\partial\zeta_2}D_{\overline{\zeta}_3,\zeta_1}\right)\frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{\xi_3}} \\ \text{using (4.8) and (4.9)} &= D_{\zeta_2,\overline{\zeta_3}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi_1} + D_{\overline{\zeta_3},\zeta_1}\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi_2} + D_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\overline{\xi_3}}, \end{aligned}$$

and the proof is complete. □

5. Geometric Interpretation of the Involution $\mathcal{T}$

In this section we are going to prove a theorem which sheds light into the mysterious nature of the involution $\mathcal{T}$. Speaking in terms of the isomorphism ϖ of the configuration space $\mathfrak{F}$ and the cross–ratio variety $\mathfrak{X}$, if $[\mathfrak{p}] \in \mathfrak{F}$ such that not all points of $\mathfrak{p}$ lie in the same $\mathbb{C}-$circle, then

$(\varpi^{-1}\circ\mathcal{T}\circ\varpi)([\mathfrak{p}])$ is the class $[\mathfrak{p}']$, where $\mathfrak{p}'$ is the quadruple of pairwise distinct points which are obtained after applying at points of $\mathfrak{p}$ certain elements of $\mathrm{PU}(2,1)$ which are congruent to Heisenberg similarities depending only on $\mathbb{X}_i$, $i=1,2,3$, where $(\mathbb{X}_1,\mathbb{X}_2,\mathbb{X}_3)=\varpi([\mathfrak{p}])$. More precisely, we have:

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\mathfrak{p}=(p_1,p_2,p_3,p_4)$ and $\mathfrak{p}'=(p_1',p_2',p_3',p_4')$ be two quadruples of pairwise distinct points in $\partial\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ with respective cross ratios $\mathbb{X}_i$ and $\mathbb{X}_i'$, $i=1,2,3$. Assume that:*

a) *Neither the quadruple $\mathfrak{p}$ nor the quadruple $\mathfrak{p}'$ belongs to a $\mathbb{C}-$circle.*
b) *$\Im(\mathbb{X}_3)$ and $\Im(\mathbb{X}_3')$ are both different from zero.*

Then $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{X}_1,\mathbb{X}_2,\mathbb{X}_3)=(\mathbb{X}_1',\mathbb{X}_2',\mathbb{X}_3')$ if and only if there exist holomorphic isometries g_1, g_4 of $\partial\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ such that:

(1) *$g_i(p_2)=p_2'$, $g_i(p_3)=p_3'$ for $i=1,4$, $g_1(p_1)=p_4'$, $g_4(p_4)=p_1'$;*
(2) *the composition $g_1\circ g_4$ is conjugate to the rotation in an angle $\arg(\mathbb{X}_3)$;*
(3) *the composition $g_1\circ g_4^{-1}$ is conjugate to the dilation by $|\mathbb{X}_3|$ followed by the rotation in an angle $2\arg\left(\frac{1-\mathbb{X}_1-\mathbb{X}_2}{\mathbb{X}_1^{1/2}\mathbb{X}_2^{1/2}}\right)$.*

For the proof, we need some preliminary discussion first. Associated to a quadruple of points $\mathfrak{p}=(p_1,p_2,p_3,p_4)$ are the following Cartan's angular invariants:

$$\mathbb{A}_1(\mathfrak{p})=\mathbb{A}(p_2,p_3,p_4),\quad \mathbb{A}_2(\mathfrak{p})=\mathbb{A}(p_1,p_3,p_4),\quad \mathbb{A}_3(\mathfrak{p})=\mathbb{A}(p_1,p_2,p_4),\quad \mathbb{A}_4(\mathfrak{p})=\mathbb{A}(p_1,p_2,p_3).$$

The next proposition shows the connection of $\mathbb{A}_i(\mathfrak{p})$ with the cross–ratios $\mathbb{X}_i(\mathfrak{p})$ as well as the connection between them.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $\mathfrak{p}=(p_1,p_2,p_3,p_4)$ a quadruple of pairwise distinct points in $\partial\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$, $\mathbb{X}_i=\mathbb{X}_i(\mathfrak{p})$ $i=1,2,3$ and $\mathbb{A}_i=\mathbb{A}_i(\mathfrak{p})$. Then*

$$\arg(\mathbb{X}_1)=\mathbb{A}_1-\mathbb{A}_2,\quad \arg(\mathbb{X}_2)=-\mathbb{A}_2-\mathbb{A}_4,\quad \arg(\mathbb{X}_3)=\mathbb{A}_4-\mathbb{A}_1,$$
$$\mathbb{A}_3=\mathbb{A}_2-\mathbb{A}_1+\mathbb{A}_4.$$

Proof. We only prove the first of these identities; the proof of the rest is similar and it is left to the reader. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\arg\mathbb{X}_1 &= \arg\frac{\langle\mathbf{p}_4,\mathbf{p}_2\rangle\langle\mathbf{p}_3,\mathbf{p}_1\rangle}{\langle\mathbf{p}_4,\mathbf{p}_1\rangle\langle\mathbf{p}_3,\mathbf{p}_2\rangle}\\
&= \arg\frac{\langle\mathbf{p}_4,\mathbf{p}_2\rangle\langle\mathbf{p}_2,\mathbf{p}_3\rangle\langle\mathbf{p}_3,\mathbf{p}_1\rangle\langle\mathbf{p}_1,\mathbf{p}_3\rangle}{\langle\mathbf{p}_4,\mathbf{p}_1\rangle\langle\mathbf{p}_2,\mathbf{p}_3\rangle\langle\mathbf{p}_3,\mathbf{p}_2\rangle\langle\mathbf{p}_1,\mathbf{p}_3\rangle}\\
&= \arg\frac{\langle\mathbf{p}_4,\mathbf{p}_2\rangle\langle\mathbf{p}_2,\mathbf{p}_3\rangle\,|\langle\mathbf{p}_1,\mathbf{p}_3\rangle|^2}{\langle\mathbf{p}_1,\mathbf{p}_3\rangle\langle\mathbf{p}_4,\mathbf{p}_1\rangle\,|\langle\mathbf{p}_2,\mathbf{p}_3\rangle|^2}\\
&= \arg\frac{\langle\mathbf{p}_2,\mathbf{p}_3\rangle\langle\mathbf{p}_3,\mathbf{p}_4\rangle\langle\mathbf{p}_4,\mathbf{p}_2\rangle}{\langle\mathbf{p}_1,\mathbf{p}_3\rangle\langle\mathbf{p}_3,\mathbf{p}_4\rangle\langle\mathbf{p}_4,\mathbf{p}_1\rangle}\\
&= \arg\left(-\langle\mathbf{p}_2,\mathbf{p}_3\rangle\langle\mathbf{p}_3,\mathbf{p}_4\rangle\langle\mathbf{p}_4,\mathbf{p}_2\rangle\right)-\arg\left(-\langle\mathbf{p}_1,\mathbf{p}_3\rangle\langle\mathbf{p}_3,\mathbf{p}_4\rangle\langle\mathbf{p}_4,\mathbf{p}_1\rangle\right)\\
&= \mathbb{A}_1-\mathbb{A}_2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

We now need the following two lemmas.

Lemma 5.3. *With the assumptions of Theorem 5.1, let also $\mathbb{A}_i$ and $\mathbb{A}_i'$, $i=1,2,3,4$, be the respective Cartan's angular invariants of $\mathfrak{p}$ and $\mathfrak{p}'$. Let also*

$$2\eta=\arg(1-\mathbb{X}_1-\mathbb{X}_2),\quad 2\eta'=\arg(1-\mathbb{X}_1'-\mathbb{X}_2').$$

Then, the following are equivalent:

i) $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{X}_1,\mathbb{X}_2,\mathbb{X}_3)=(\mathbb{X}_1',\mathbb{X}_2',\mathbb{X}_3')$.
ii) $|\mathbb{X}_i|=|\mathbb{X}_i'|$, $i=1,2$, *and* $\mathbb{A}_1=\mathbb{A}_4'$, $\mathbb{A}_2=\mathbb{A}_3'$, $\mathbb{A}_3=\mathbb{A}_2'$, $\mathbb{A}_4=\mathbb{A}_1'$.
iii) $|\mathbb{X}_3|=|\mathbb{X}_3'|$ *and* $\eta=\eta'$, $\mathbb{A}_1=\mathbb{A}_4'$, $\mathbb{A}_2=\mathbb{A}_3'$, $\mathbb{A}_3=\mathbb{A}_2'$, $\mathbb{A}_4=\mathbb{A}_1'$.

Proof. We first prove direction i) $\Rightarrow$ iii). Since $\mathbb{X}_i=\mathbb{X}_i'$, $i=1,2$ and $\mathbb{X}_3'=\overline{\mathbb{X}_3}$ we clearly have $|\mathbb{X}_3|=|\mathbb{X}_3'|$ and also $2\eta=2\eta'$. Now, from the relations $\arg(\mathbb{X}_i)=\arg(\mathbb{X}_i')$, $i=1,2$ and $\arg(\mathbb{X}_3)=-\arg(\mathbb{X}_3')$, we also have from Proposition 5.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{A}_1-\mathbb{A}_2&=\mathbb{A}_1'-\mathbb{A}_2',\\ \mathbb{A}_2+\mathbb{A}_4&=\mathbb{A}_2'+\mathbb{A}_4',\\ \mathbb{A}_3-\mathbb{A}_2&=-\mathbb{A}_3'+\mathbb{A}_2.\end{aligned}$$

Again by Proposition 5.2, the third equation can be replaced by the equivalent $\mathbb{A}_4-\mathbb{A}_1=\mathbb{A}_1'-\mathbb{A}_4'$; solving the 3×3 system in $\mathbb{A}_1,\mathbb{A}_2$ and $\mathbb{A}_4$ we get

$$\mathbb{A}_1=\mathbb{A}_4',\quad \mathbb{A}_4=\mathbb{A}_1',\quad \mathbb{A}_2=\mathbb{A}_2'+\mathbb{A}_4'-\mathbb{A}_1'=\mathbb{A}_3'.$$

Hence this also yields

$$\mathbb{A}_3=\mathbb{A}_2+\mathbb{A}_4-\mathbb{A}_1=\mathbb{A}_3'+\mathbb{A}_1'-\mathbb{A}_4'=\mathbb{A}_2'.$$

To prove direction iii) $\Rightarrow$ ii) we first show that

$$e^{2i\eta}=\frac{1-\mathbb{X}_1-\mathbb{X}_2}{|1-\mathbb{X}_1-\mathbb{X}_2|},\quad\text{and}\quad 2|\mathbb{X}_1|^{1/2}|\mathbb{X}_2|^{1/2}\sqrt{\cos(\mathbb{A}_1)\cos(\mathbb{A}_4)}=|1-\mathbb{X}_1-\mathbb{X}_2|. \tag{5.1}$$

The left equation is following from the definition of η. As for the right equation, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}|1-\mathbb{X}_1-\mathbb{X}_2|^2 &= 1+|\mathbb{X}_1|^2+|\mathbb{X}_2|^2-2\Re(\mathbb{X}_1)-2\Re(\mathbb{X}_2)+2\Re(\mathbb{X}_1\overline{\mathbb{X}_2})\\ &= 2|\mathbb{X}_1|^2\Re(\mathbb{X}_3)+2\Re(\mathbb{X}_1\overline{\mathbb{X}_2})\\ &= 2|\mathbb{X}_1||\mathbb{X}_2|\left(\cos(\arg(\mathbb{X}_3))+\cos(\arg(\mathbb{X}_1\overline{\mathbb{X}_2}))\right)\\ &= 2|\mathbb{X}_1||\mathbb{X}_2|\left(\cos(\mathbb{A}_4-\mathbb{A}_1)+\cos(\mathbb{A}_1+\mathbb{A}_4)\right))\\ &= 4|\mathbb{X}_1||\mathbb{X}_2|\cos(\mathbb{A}_1)\cos(\mathbb{A}_4).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\eta=\eta'$ implies

$$e^{2i\eta}=\frac{1-\mathbb{X}_1-\mathbb{X}_2}{2|\mathbb{X}_1|^{1/2}|\mathbb{X}_2|^{1/2}\sqrt{\cos(\mathbb{A}_1)\cos(\mathbb{A}_4)}}=\frac{1-\mathbb{X}_1'-\mathbb{X}_2'}{2|\mathbb{X}_1'|^{1/2}|\mathbb{X}_2'|^{1/2}\sqrt{\cos(\mathbb{A}_1')\cos(\mathbb{A}_4')}}=e^{2i\eta'}.$$

Since we additionally have $|\mathbb{X}_3|=|\mathbb{X}_3'|$, $\mathbb{A}_1=\mathbb{A}_4'$ and $\mathbb{A}_4=\mathbb{A}_1'$, this is equivalent to

$$\frac{1-\mathbb{X}_1-\mathbb{X}_2}{|\mathbb{X}_1|}=\frac{1-\mathbb{X}_1'-\mathbb{X}_2'}{|\mathbb{X}_1'|}.$$

From the conditions on Cartan's angular invariants we have $\arg\mathbb{X}_1=\arg\mathbb{X}_i'$, $i=1,2$; the above equation then implies

$$\frac{1}{|\mathbb{X}_1|}-e^{i\arg(\mathbb{X}_1)}-|\mathbb{X}_3|e^{i\arg(|\mathbb{X}_2|)}=\frac{1}{|\mathbb{X}_1'|}-e^{i\arg(\mathbb{X}_1)}-|\mathbb{X}_3|e^{i\arg(|\mathbb{X}_2|)}.$$

Hence $|\mathbb{X}_1|=|\mathbb{X}_1'|$ and therefore also $|\mathbb{X}_2|=|\mathbb{X}_2'|$.

Finally, we prove direction ii) $\Rightarrow$ i).

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{X}_1' &= |\mathbb{X}_1'|e^{i\arg(\mathbb{X}_1')} = |\mathbb{X}_1|e^{i(\mathbb{A}_1'-\mathbb{A}_2')} = |\mathbb{X}_1|e^{i(\mathbb{A}_4-\mathbb{A}_3)} = |\mathbb{X}_1|e^{i(\mathbb{A}_1-\mathbb{A}_2)} = |\mathbb{X}_1|e^{i\arg(\mathbb{X}_1)} = \mathbb{X}_1,\\
\mathbb{X}_2' &= |\mathbb{X}_2'|e^{i\arg(\mathbb{X}_2')} = |\mathbb{X}_1|e^{-i(\mathbb{A}_2'+\mathbb{A}_4')} = |\mathbb{X}_2|e^{-i(\mathbb{A}_2+\mathbb{A}_1)} = |\mathbb{X}_2|e^{-i(\mathbb{A}_2+\mathbb{A}_4)} = |\mathbb{X}_2|e^{i\arg(\mathbb{X}_2)} = \mathbb{X}_2,\\
\mathbb{X}_3' &= |\mathbb{X}_3'|e^{i\arg(\mathbb{X}_3')} = |\mathbb{X}_3|e^{i(\mathbb{A}_4'-\mathbb{A}_1')} = |\mathbb{X}_3|e^{i(\mathbb{A}_1-\mathbb{A}_4)} = |\mathbb{X}_3|e^{-i\arg(\mathbb{X}_3)} = \overline{\mathbb{X}_3},
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. □

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\mathfrak{p} = (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4)$ a quadruple of pairwise distinct points of $\partial\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ with cross–ratios $\mathbb{X}_1, \mathbb{X}_2, \mathbb{X}_3$ and assume that $\mathfrak{p}$ does not belong to a $\mathbb{C}-$circle and also that $\Im(\mathbb{X}_3)$ is different from zero. Then we can normalise so that*

$$\begin{aligned}
p_1 &= (z_1, t_1) = \left(\sqrt{\cos(\mathbb{A}_4)}e^{-i\mathbb{A}_3},\ \sin(\mathbb{A}_4)\right),\\
p_2 &= \infty, \quad p_3 = (0,0),\\
p_4 &= (z_4, t_4) = \left(-\sqrt{\cos(\mathbb{A}_1)}|\mathbb{X}_3|^{1/2}e^{2i\eta},\ |\mathbb{X}_3|\sin(\mathbb{A}_1)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Here $\mathbb{A}_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, 4$ are the Cartan's angular invariants of $\mathfrak{p}$ and $2\eta = \arg(1 - \mathbb{X}_1 - \mathbb{X}_2)$.

Proof. By applying a suitable element of $\mathrm{PU}(2,1)$ we may normalise so that p_i have lifts

$$\mathbf{p}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -e^{-i\mathbb{A}_4} \\ \sqrt{2\cos(\mathbb{A}_4)}e^{-i\mathbb{A}_3} \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{p}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{p}_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{p}_4 = \begin{bmatrix} -|\mathbb{X}_3|e^{-i\mathbb{A}_1} \\ -\sqrt{2\cos(\mathbb{A}_1)}|\mathbb{X}_3|^{1/2}e^{2i\eta} \\ 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

(compare with the expression in the proof of Proposition 5.5 in [13]). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2\rangle = \langle \mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{p}_3\rangle = \langle \mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{p}_4\rangle = 1,\\
\langle \mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_3\rangle = -e^{-i\mathbb{A}_4}, \quad \langle \mathbf{p}_3, \mathbf{p}_4\rangle = -|\mathbb{X}_3|e^{i\mathbb{A}_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_4\rangle &= -e^{-i\mathbb{A}_4} - |\mathbb{X}_3|e^{i\mathbb{A}_1} - 2\sqrt{\cos(\mathbb{A}_1)\cos(\mathbb{A}_4)}|\mathbb{X}_3|^{1/2}e^{-2i\eta}\cdot e^{-i\mathbb{A}_3}\\
&= -e^{-i\mathbb{A}_4} - \frac{|\mathbb{X}_2|}{|\mathbb{X}_1|}e^{i\mathbb{A}_1} - 2\sqrt{\cos(\mathbb{A}_1)\cos(\mathbb{A}_4)}\frac{|\mathbb{X}_2|^{1/2}}{|\mathbb{X}_1|^{1/2}}e^{-2i\eta}\cdot e^{-i\mathbb{A}_3}\\
&= -e^{-i\mathbb{A}_4} - \frac{|\mathbb{X}_2|}{|\mathbb{X}_1|}e^{i\mathbb{A}_1} - \frac{|1-\mathbb{X}_1-\mathbb{X}_2|}{|\mathbb{X}_1|^{1/2}|\mathbb{X}_2|^{1/2}}\cdot\frac{|\mathbb{X}_2|^{1/2}}{|\mathbb{X}_1|^{1/2}}\cdot\frac{1-\overline{\mathbb{X}_1}-\overline{\mathbb{X}_2}}{|1-\mathbb{X}_1-\mathbb{X}_2|}\cdot e^{-i\mathbb{A}_3}\\
&= -\frac{|\mathbb{X}_1|e^{i(\mathbb{A}_3-\mathbb{A}_4)} + |\mathbb{X}_2|e^{i(\mathbb{A}_1+\mathbb{A}_3)} + 1 - \overline{\mathbb{X}_1} - \overline{\mathbb{X}_2}}{|\mathbb{X}_1|e^{i\mathbb{A}_3}}\\
&= -\frac{\overline{\mathbb{X}_1} + \overline{\mathbb{X}_2} + 1 - \overline{\mathbb{X}_1} - \overline{\mathbb{X}_2}}{|\mathbb{X}_1|e^{i\mathbb{A}_3}}\\
&= -|\mathbb{X}_1|^{-1}e^{-i\mathbb{A}_3},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used equations (5.1). Therefore we get

$$\frac{\langle \mathbf{p}_4,\mathbf{p}_2\rangle\langle \mathbf{p}_3,\mathbf{p}_1\rangle}{\langle \mathbf{p}_4,\mathbf{p}_1\rangle\langle \mathbf{p}_3,\mathbf{p}_2\rangle}=\frac{-e^{i\mathbb{A}_4}}{-|\mathbb{X}_1|^{-1}e^{i\mathbb{A}_3}}=\mathbb{X}_1,$$
$$\frac{\langle \mathbf{p}_4,\mathbf{p}_3\rangle\langle \mathbf{p}_2,\mathbf{p}_1\rangle}{\langle \mathbf{p}_4,\mathbf{p}_1\rangle\langle \mathbf{p}_2,\mathbf{p}_3\rangle}=\frac{-|\mathbb{X}_3|e^{-i\mathbb{A}_1}}{-|\mathbb{X}_1|^{-1}e^{i\mathbb{A}_3}}=\mathbb{X}_2,$$
$$\frac{\langle \mathbf{p}_4,\mathbf{p}_3\rangle\langle \mathbf{p}_2,\mathbf{p}_1\rangle}{\langle \mathbf{p}_4,\mathbf{p}_2\rangle\langle \mathbf{p}_1,\mathbf{p}_3\rangle}=\frac{-|\mathbb{X}_3|e^{-i\mathbb{A}_1}}{-e^{-i\mathbb{A}_4}}=\mathbb{X}_3.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 5.1.
Using Lemma 5.4 we normalise so that

$$p_1=(z_1,t_1)=\left(\sqrt{\cos(\mathbb{A}_4)}e^{-i\mathbb{A}_3},\ \sin(\mathbb{A}_4)\right),$$
$$p_2=\infty,\quad p_3=(0,0),$$
$$p_4=(z_4,t_4)=\left(-\sqrt{\cos(\mathbb{A}_1)}|\mathbb{X}_3|^{1/2}e^{2i\eta},\ |\mathbb{X}_3|\sin(\mathbb{A}_1)\right).$$

Suppose first that $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{X}_1,\mathbb{X}_2,\mathbb{X}_3)=(\mathbb{X}_1',\mathbb{X}_2',\mathbb{X}_3')$. Then, using iii) of Lemma 5.3 we have the following normalisation for p_i', $i=1,\dots,4$:

$$p_1'=(z_1',t_1')=\left(\sqrt{\cos(\mathbb{A}_1)}e^{-i\mathbb{A}_2},\ \sin(\mathbb{A}_1)\right),$$
$$p_2'=\infty,\quad p_3'=(0,0),$$
$$p_4'=(z_4',t_4')=\left(-\sqrt{\cos(\mathbb{A}_4)}|\mathbb{X}_3|^{1/2}e^{2i\eta},\ |\mathbb{X}_3|\sin(\mathbb{A}_4)\right).$$

It follows after elementary calculations that the transformations

$$g_1(z,t)=\left(-|\mathbb{X}_3|^{1/2}e^{i(2\eta+\mathbb{A}_3)}z,|\mathbb{X}_3|t\right),\quad g_4(z,t)=\left(-|\mathbb{X}_3|^{-1/2}e^{-i(2\eta+\mathbb{A}_2)}z,|\mathbb{X}_3|^{-1}t\right),$$

satisfy conditions (1), (2) and (3) of the theorem.

Conversely, suppose that there exist g_i, $i=1,4$ as in the conditions of the theorem. We write

$$g_1(z,t)=\left(e^{l_1+3i\theta_1}z,e^{2l_1}t\right),$$
$$g_4(z,t)=\left(e^{l_4+3i\theta_4}z,e^{2l_4}t\right).$$

From (1), and since g_1 maps (p_1,p_2,p_3) to (p_4',p_2',p_3') we have $\mathbb{A}_4=\mathbb{A}_1'$. Also, since g_4 maps (p_2,p_3,p_4) to (p_2',p_3',p_1') we have $\mathbb{A}_1=\mathbb{A}_4'$. By our assumptions,

$$l_1=\log(|\mathbb{X}_3|)^{1/2},\quad l_4=\log(|\mathbb{X}_3|)^{-1/2},$$
$$3\theta_1=2\eta+\mathbb{A}_3,\quad 3\theta_4=-2\eta-\mathbb{A}_2.$$

Under our normalisation assumptions, $g_1(z_1,t_1)=(z_4',t_4')$ gives $2\eta=2\eta'\mod(\pi)$. Using this, $g_4(z_4,t_4)=(z_1',t_1')$ gives $\mathbb{A}_2=\mathbb{A}_3'$ and therefore also $\mathbb{A}_3'=\mathbb{A}_2$. The result now follows from iii) of Lemma 5.3.

□

6. Further Comments on the Cross–Ratio Variety

This section contains further supplementary information about the cross–ratio variety $\mathfrak{X}$. Using the Cartan's angular invariants associated to certain triples of a given quadruple $\mathfrak{p}$ of pairwise distinct points, we are able to give an alternative description of $\mathfrak{X}$ in Section 6.1. Section 6.2 is concerned with the analytic description of singular sets; the complex singular set $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{C}}$ which is the largest of all singular sets and the one with the richer structure, is studied in Section 6.2.2.

6.1. **An alternative description of $\mathfrak{X}$.** We may give an alternative description of $\mathfrak{X}$ using the results of Proposition 5.1. Plugging those into Equation (3.2), we immediately have a counterpart of Proposition 3.3, as an alternative definition of the cross–ratio variety $\mathfrak{X}$.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $\mathfrak{p} = (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4)$ be any quadruple of pairwise distinct points in $\partial\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$. Let*

$$\mathbb{X}_1(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathbb{X}(p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4), \quad \mathbb{X}_2(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathbb{X}(p_1, p_3, p_2, p_4),$$

and

$$\mathbb{A}_1(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathbb{A}(p_2, p_3, p_4), \quad \mathbb{A}_2(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathbb{A}(p_1, p_3, p_4), \quad \mathbb{A}_4(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathbb{A}(p_1, p_2, p_3).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{X}_1|^2 + |\mathbb{X}_2|^2 &= 2|\mathbb{X}_1||\mathbb{X}_2|\cos(\mathbb{A}_1 - \mathbb{A}_4) \\ &\quad +2|\mathbb{X}_1|\cos(\mathbb{A}_2 - \mathbb{A}_1) + 2|\mathbb{X}_2|\cos(\mathbb{A}_2 + \mathbb{A}_4) - 1. \end{aligned}$$

In this manner we obtain a description of $\mathfrak{X}$ as a 4–dimensional real subset of $\mathbb{R}^2_+ \times [-\pi/2, \pi/2]^3$, compare to the one in [4]. We underline that the choice of $\mathbb{A}_1, \mathbb{A}_2$ and $\mathbb{A}_4$ is arbitrary; Proposition 6.1 can be modified analogously for any other choice of three Cartan's angular invariants among $\mathbb{A}_i(\mathfrak{p})$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$.

The next lemma which relates cross–ratios and Cartan's angular invariants will be useful in our subsequent discussion.

Lemma 6.2. *The following formulae fold.*

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{X}_1 + \mathbb{X}_2 - 1|^2 &= 4|\mathbb{X}_1||\mathbb{X}_2|\cos(\mathbb{A}_1)\cos(\mathbb{A}_4), \\ |\mathbb{X}_1 + \overline{\mathbb{X}_2} - 1|^2 &= 4|\mathbb{X}_1||\mathbb{X}_2|\cos(\mathbb{A}_2)\cos(\mathbb{A}_3), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\mathbb{X}_3 + \frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_1} - 1\right|^2 &= 4\frac{|\mathbb{X}_3|}{|\mathbb{X}_1|}\cos(\mathbb{A}_2)\cos(\mathbb{A}_4), \\ \left|\overline{\mathbb{X}_3} + \frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_1} - 1\right|^2 &= 4\frac{|\mathbb{X}_3|}{|\mathbb{X}_1|}\cos(\mathbb{A}_1)\cos(\mathbb{A}_3), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_2} + \frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_3} - 1\right|^2 &= \frac{4}{|\mathbb{X}_2||\mathbb{X}_3|}\cos(\mathbb{A}_3)\cos(\mathbb{A}_4), \\ \left|\frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_2} + \frac{1}{\overline{\mathbb{X}_3}} - 1\right|^2 &= \frac{4}{|\mathbb{X}_2||\mathbb{X}_3|}\cos(\mathbb{A}_1)\cos(\mathbb{A}_2). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof of the first identity is incorporated in the proof of Lemma 5.3. All the other equalities are proved in an analogous manner.

□

6.2. **Properties and Structures of Singular Sets.**

6.2.1. *Real and* CR *singular sets.* Lemma 6.2 induces two corollaries from which we obtain the manifold description of the real singular set $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and the CR singular sets $\mathfrak{X}_{\rm CR}$ and $\mathfrak{X}^*_{\rm CR}$.

Corollary 6.3. *Let $\mathfrak{p}=(p_1,p_2,p_3,p_4)$ be a quadruple of pairwise distinct points in $\partial\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ and let $\mathbb{X}_i(\mathfrak{p})$, $i=1,2,3$ be its cross–ratios. The following hold:*

i) *$\mathbb{X}_1(\mathfrak{p})+\mathbb{X}_2(\mathfrak{p})=1$ if and only if either p_1,p_2,p_3 or p_2,p_3,p_4 lie in the same $\mathbb{C}-$circle. In the first case*
$$\mathbb{X}_3(\mathfrak{p})+\frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_1(\mathfrak{p})}=1 \quad \textit{and} \quad \frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_2(\mathfrak{p})}+\frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_3(\mathfrak{p})}=1,$$
and in the second case
$$\overline{\mathbb{X}_3(\mathfrak{p})}+\frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_(\mathfrak{p})}=1 \quad \textit{and} \quad \frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_2(\mathfrak{p})}+\frac{1}{\overline{\mathbb{X}_3(\mathfrak{p})}}=1.$$

ii) *$\mathbb{X}_3(\mathfrak{p})+\frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_1(\mathfrak{p})}=1$ if and only if either p_1,p_3,p_4 or p_1,p_2,p_3 lie in the same $\mathbb{C}-$circle. In the first case*
$$\mathbb{X}_1(\mathfrak{p})+\mathbb{X}_2(\mathfrak{p})=1 \quad \textit{and} \quad \frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_2(\mathfrak{p})}+\frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_3(\mathfrak{p})}=1,$$
and in the second case
$$\mathbb{X}_1(\mathfrak{p})+\overline{\mathbb{X}_2(\mathfrak{p})}=1 \quad \textit{and} \quad \frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_2(\mathfrak{p})}+\frac{1}{\overline{\mathbb{X}_3(\mathfrak{p})}}=1.$$

iii) *$\frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_2(\mathfrak{p})}+\frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_3(\mathfrak{p})}=1$ if and only if either p_1,p_2,p_3 or p_1,p_2,p_4 lie in the same $\mathbb{C}-$circle. In the first case*
$$\mathbb{X}_1(\mathfrak{p})+\mathbb{X}_2(\mathfrak{p})=1 \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathbb{X}_3(\mathfrak{p})+\frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_1(\mathfrak{p})}=1,$$
and in the second case
$$\mathbb{X}_1(\mathfrak{p})+\overline{\mathbb{X}_2(\mathfrak{p})}=1 \quad \textit{and} \quad \overline{\mathbb{X}_3(\mathfrak{p})}+\frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_2(\mathfrak{p})}=1.$$

In the specific case where all points of $\mathfrak{p}$ lie in a $\mathbb{C}-$circle we have:

Corollary 6.4. *Let $\mathfrak{p}=(p_1,p_2,p_3,p_4)$ be a quadruple of points in $\partial\mathbf{H}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$. The following are equivalent:*

i) *All p_i lie in the same $\mathbb{C}-$circle;*
ii) *$\mathbb{X}_i(\mathfrak{p})\in\mathbb{R}$, $i=1,2$ and $\mathbb{X}_1(\mathfrak{p})+\mathbb{X}_2(\mathfrak{p})=1$;*
iii) *$\mathbb{X}_i(\mathfrak{p})\in\mathbb{R}$, $i=1,3$ and $\mathbb{X}_3(\mathfrak{p})+\frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_1(\mathfrak{p})}=1$;*
iv) *$\mathbb{X}_i(\mathfrak{p})\in\mathbb{R}$, $i=2,3$ and $\frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_2(\mathfrak{p})}+\frac{1}{\mathbb{X}_3(\mathfrak{p})}=1$;*
v) *$\mathbb{X}_i(\mathfrak{p})\in\mathbb{R}$, $i=1,2,3$ and $\mathbb{X}_3=-\mathbb{X}_2/\mathbb{X}_1$.*

We note that condition i) $\Leftrightarrow$ v) is Proposition 5.13 of [13]. The next proposition describes the differentiable structure of $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{R}}$, $\mathfrak{X}_{\rm CR}$ and $\mathfrak{X}^*_{\rm CR}$.

Proposition 6.5. *Consider the singular sets $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{R}}$, $\mathfrak{X}_{\rm CR}$ and $\mathfrak{X}^*_{\rm CR}$ of cross–ratio variety $\mathfrak{X}$. The following hold:*

i) *The real singular set $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is a 1–dimensional disconnected real manifold, isomorphic to the real line $x+y=1$ with the points $(0,1)$ and $(1,0)$ removed.*
ii) *The* CR *singular set $\mathfrak{X}_{\rm CR}$ and the singular set $\mathfrak{X}^*_{\rm CR}$ are 1–dimensional complex manifolds, both biholomorphic to $\mathbb{C}-\{0,1\}$. Moreover, the real singular set $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is contained in $\mathfrak{X}_{\rm CR}$ (and in $\mathfrak{X}^*_{\rm CR}$) as a disconnected real submanifold.*

6.2.2. *The complex singular set.* Finally, we turn our attention to the complex singular set $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{C}}$. First, we make the following observation: From the defining Equation (3.2) of $\mathfrak{X}$ and the obvious inequality $-\Re(\mathbb{X}_3) \leq \mathbb{X}_3 \leq \Re(\mathbb{X}_3)$ we have

$$(|\mathbb{X}_1| - |\mathbb{X}_2|)^2 \leq 2\Re(\mathbb{X}_1 + \mathbb{X}_2) - 1 \leq (|\mathbb{X}_1| + |\mathbb{X}_2|)^2 . \tag{6.1}$$

If $\Im(\mathbb{X}_3) = 0$, then $\Re(\mathbb{X}_3) = |\mathbb{X}_3|$ or $\Re(\mathbb{X}_3) = -|\mathbb{X}_3|$ and thus we have either

$$(|\mathbb{X}_1| - |\mathbb{X}_2|)^2 = 2\Re(\mathbb{X}_1 + \mathbb{X}_2) - 1 \quad \text{or} \quad 2\Re(\mathbb{X}_1 + \mathbb{X}_2) - 1 = (|\mathbb{X}_1| + |\mathbb{X}_2|)^2 , \tag{6.2}$$

respectively. Therefore, excluding all points of $\mathfrak{X}$ at which $\Im(\mathbb{X}_3) = 0$, we obtain strict inequalities in (6.1).

Proposition 6.6. *The following holds.*

$$\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{C}} = \{(\mathbb{X}_1, \mathbb{X}_2, \mathbb{X}_3) \in \mathfrak{X} \mid \mathbb{X}_3 > 0\} \cup \mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

Moreover, the set of triples of cross–ratios corresponding to quadruples that lie in an $\mathbb{R}-$circle or in a $\mathbb{C}-$circle is contained in $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{C}}$.

Proof. We only prove the second assertion of our proposition. All triples of cross–ratios corresponding to quadruples that lie in an $\mathbb{R}-$circle are contained in $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{C}}$. This is because in that case (cf. Proposition 5.14 of [13]) $\mathbb{X}_i > 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, 3$ and moreover

$$(\mathbb{X}_1 - \mathbb{X}_2)^2 = 2\mathbb{X}_1 + \mathbb{X}_2 - 1.$$

Next, consider triples of cross–ratios corresponding to quadruples that lie in a $\mathbb{C}-$circle. For such a triple we have that $\mathbb{X}_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{X}_1 + \mathbb{X}_2 = 1$. The following possibilities can occur:

(1) $\mathbb{X}_1\mathbb{X}_2 > 0,\ \mathbb{X}_3 = -\mathbb{X}_2/\mathbb{X}_1 < 0$ and
(2) $\mathbb{X}_1\mathbb{X}_2 < 0,\ \mathbb{X}_3 = -\mathbb{X}_2/\mathbb{X}_1 > 0.$

In case (1) the right Equation (6.2) is satisfied; the left Equation (6.2) is satisfied in case (2). □

We may now write the complex singular set $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{C}}$ of the cross–ratio variety $\mathfrak{X}$ as the disjoint union of $\mathfrak{X}^1_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\mathfrak{X}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ where

$$\mathfrak{X}^1_{\mathbb{C}} = \{(\mathbb{X}_1, \mathbb{X}_2, \mathbb{X}_3) \in \mathfrak{X} \mid\ (|\mathbb{X}_1| - |\mathbb{X}_2|)^2 = 2\Re(\mathbb{X}_1) + 2\Re(\mathbb{X}_2) - 1\}, \tag{6.3}$$

$$\mathfrak{X}^2_{\mathbb{C}} = \{(\mathbb{X}_1, \mathbb{X}_2, \mathbb{X}_3) \in \mathfrak{X} \mid\ (|\mathbb{X}_1| + |\mathbb{X}_2|)^2 = 2\Re(\mathbb{X}_1) + 2\Re(\mathbb{X}_2) - 1\}. \tag{6.4}$$

Proposition 6.7. *Let $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{C}}$ be the complex singular set of $\mathfrak{X}$ and let also $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{X}^1_{\mathbb{C}} \cup \mathfrak{X}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ where $\mathfrak{X}^1_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\mathfrak{X}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ are as in (6.3) and (6.4), respectively.*

(1) $\mathfrak{X}^*_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{X}^1_{\mathbb{C}} - \{(\mathbb{X}_1, \mathbb{X}_2, \mathbb{X}_3) \mid \mathbb{X}_1 + \mathbb{X}_2 = 1,\ \mathbb{X}_1\mathbb{X}_2 > 0\}$ *admits the structure of a 3–dimensional submanifold of $\mathbb{C}^2$.*
(2) $\mathfrak{X}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ *is a 1–dimensional disconnected manifold diffeomorphic to the disjoint union of the two open open line segments given by $x_1 + x_2 = 1$, $x_1x_2 < 0$.*

Proof. We only sketch the proof of (1). Let $\zeta_i = x_i + iy_i$, $i = 1, 2$ and the equation

$$F(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) = (|\zeta_1| - |\zeta_2|)^2 - 2\Re(\zeta_1 + \zeta_2) + 1 = 0.$$

We have

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial x_1} = 2\left[\left(1 - \frac{|\zeta_2|}{|\zeta_1|}\right) x_1 - 1\right], \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_2} = 2\left[\left(1 - \frac{|\zeta_1|}{|\zeta_2|}\right) x_2 - 1\right],$$
$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial y_1} = 2\left(1 - \frac{|\zeta_2|}{|\zeta_1|}\right) y_1, \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial y_2} = 2\left(1 - \frac{|\zeta_1|}{|\zeta_2|}\right) y_2,$$

and the reader may verify that all partial derivatives vanish at points where $y_1 = y_2 = 0$ and $x_1 + x_2 = 1$, $x_1 x_2 > 0$. □

A codimension 1 CR structure is called strictly pseudoconvex if the Levi form is strictly positive. We have the following:

Proposition 6.8. *There is a strictly pseudoconvex* CR *structure of codimension 1 defined on* $\mathfrak{X}^*_{\mathbb{C}}$.

Proof. Consider the equation

$$F(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) = (|\zeta_1| - |\zeta_2|)^2 - 2\Re(\zeta_1 + \zeta_2) + 1 = 0.$$

We calculate

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial \overline{\zeta_1}} = \left(1 - \frac{|\zeta_2|}{|\zeta_1|}\right)\overline{\zeta_1} - 1, \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial \overline{\zeta_2}} = \left(1 - \frac{|\zeta_1|}{|\zeta_2|}\right)\overline{\zeta_2} - 1,$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial \zeta_1 \partial \overline{\zeta_1}} = 1 - \frac{|\zeta_2|}{2|\zeta_1|}, \quad \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial \zeta_1 \partial \overline{\zeta_2}} = -\frac{\overline{\zeta_1}\zeta_2}{2|\zeta_1||\zeta_2|}, \quad \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial \zeta_2 \partial \overline{\zeta_1}} = -\frac{\overline{\zeta_2}\zeta_1}{2|\zeta_1||\zeta_2|}, \quad \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial \zeta_2 \partial \overline{\zeta_2}} = 1 - \frac{|\zeta_1|}{2|\zeta_2|}.$$

Observe that all partial derivatives of the first order vanish at points (ζ_1, ζ_2) such that $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\zeta_1 + \zeta_2 = 1$. Now, straightforward calculations show that at points (ζ_1, ζ_2) such that $F(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) = 0$ we have:

$$L(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) = 1 + \frac{\Re(\zeta_1 \overline{\zeta_2})}{|\zeta_1||\zeta_2|}.$$

The above is in general greater or equal than zero; in the case where $L(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) = 0$ we have $\Re(\zeta_1 \overline{\zeta_2}) = -|\zeta_1||\zeta_2|$ and then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (|\zeta_1| - |\zeta_2|)^2 - 2\Re(\zeta_1 + \zeta_2) + 1 \\ &= |\zeta_1|^2 + |\zeta_2|^2 + 2\Re(\zeta_1 \overline{\zeta_2}) - 2\Re(\zeta_1 + \zeta_2) + 1 \\ &= |\zeta_1 + \zeta_2 - 1|^2 \end{aligned}$$

which is not the case here. The proof is complete. □

From Proposition 6.8 it follows that the set $\mathcal{P}$ as in Section 4.1 is Levi strictly pseudoconvex with smooth boundary $\mathfrak{X}^*_{\mathbb{C}}$, see p.128 of [11] for the definition of Levi pseudoconvexity.

References

[1] A. Bejancu; *Geometry of CR–submanifolds*. Kluwer Acad. Publ. Dordrecht, 1986.

[2] E. Cartan; *Sur la géométrie pseudo-conforme des hypersurfaces de l'espace de deux variables complexes*. Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. **11**:1 (1933), 1–90.

[3] E.M. Chirka; *Introduction to the geometry of CR-manifolds*. Russ. Math. Surveys **46**:1 (1991), 95–197.

[4] H. Cunha & N. Gusevskii; *On the moduli space of quadruples of points in the boundary of complex hyperbolic space*. Transform. Groups **15** (2010), no. 2, 261283.

[5] S. Dragomir & G. Tomassini *Differential Geometry and Analysis on* CR *manifolds*. Birkhäuser, Boston, 2006.

[6] E. Falbel; *Geometric structures associated to triangulations as fixed point sets of involutions*. Topol. and its Appl. **154** (2007), no. 6, 1041-1052. Corrected version in www.math.jussieu.fr/∼falbel

[7] E. Falbel & I.D. Platis; *The* $\mathrm{PU}(2,1)-$ *configuration space of four points in* S^3 *and the cross–ratio variety*. Math. Ann. **340** (2008), no. 4, 935–962.

[8] W. Goldman; *Complex hyperbolic geometry*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. Oxford Science Publications. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1999.

[9] H. Jacobowitz; *An introduction to* CR *structures*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, **32**, AMS, Providence, RI, 1990.

[10] A. Korányi & H.M. Reimann; *The complex cross ratio on the Heisenberg group*. Enseign. Math. (2) **33** (1987), no. 3-4, 291–300.

[11] S.G. Krantz; *Function theory of several complex variables*. Reprint of the 1992 edition. AMS Chelsea Publishing, Providence, RI, 2001.
[12] R.I. Mizner; *CR structures of codimension 2*. J. Diff. Geom. **30** (1989), 167–190.
[13] J.R. Parker & I.D. Platis; *Complex hyperbolic Fenchel–Nielsen coordinates*. Topology **47** (2008), 101–135.
[14] J.R. Parker & I.D. Platis; *Global geometrical coordinates on Falbel's cross-ratio variety*. Canad. Math. Bull. **52** (2009), no. 2, 285–294.
[15] L.W. Tu; *An introduction to manifolds*. Springer Science. Springer, New York 2008.

Department of Mathematics and Applied Mathematics, University Campus, Univerity of Crete, GR-70013 Voutes, Heraklion Crete, Greece
E-mail address: jplatis@math.uoc.gr